

Required Texts:

- H. Bettenson, (Editor) Documents of the Christian Church. 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press, London and New York, 1967.
H. Chadwick, The Early Church. Penguin, Baltimore, 1973.
J. C. Gager, Kingdom and Community. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1977.

Problem Areas:

Expansion of Christianity
Acceptance of the Canon of Scripture
Development of the Ordained Ministry
Councils and the Formation of Christian Doctrine
Emergence of the Primacy of the Roman See

Material for the Mid-term Examination:

The examination will be an essay type exam which will cover the first three problem areas, viz., Expansion of Christianity, Acceptance of the Canon of Scripture, Development of the Ordained Ministry. The exam will take place on Wed., Oct. 19, during the regular class period. The material for the mid-term will be from the Notes distributed, class presentations and discussions, Chadwick, pp. 1-124 and Bettenson, pp. 1-18, 26-29, 62-67.

Final Grade and Requirements for Course:

The final grade for the course will be computed from four equal elements. One quarter of the grade will come from class participation and three brief written assignments (geographical outline of Acts, critical review of Gager, essay on method). One quarter will come from the mid-term (NB, Material assigned for the mid-term will not recur on the final exam; i.e., the material for this course is NOT cumulative). One quarter will come from an 8 to 10 page typed research project connected with the subject matter studied. The workday for this project is Wednesday, Nov. 30 and the project is due during the class period on Friday Dec. 2. Projects will be returned on Fri., Dec. 9 at which time exemptions will be announced. One quarter will come from the final exam. The final exam will be held for Section A on Monday, Dec. 12 at 8:10AM and for Section B on Wednesday, Dec. 14 at 8:10 AM. Final grade is composed of four 25 point segments for a total of 100 points: (93-100 =A); 92-95=B; 84-91=C; 75-83=D=NC

Exemptions:

Projects will be returned on Friday, Dec. 9. At that time those who have gained 68 out of 75 points will be declared exempt from the final exam and receive an A for the Course. To be eligible for exemption all work must be handed in by the end of the class period on Friday, December 2.

Consulting the Professor:

Office: Foley 310; phone 213-642-2853; home phone 213-642-3170
Office Hours: Monday 3:30-5:00; Wednesday 3:30-5:00; Friday 9:00-10:00
Teaching Hours: Mon. 10:10 & 12:10; Tues. 9:35; Wed. 10:10 & 12:10 & 3:00-5:40
Thurs. 9:35; Fri. 10:10 & 12:10
Tuesday is my study day and I am unavailable.

H. J. Ryan. 7

August 15, 1977

My dear student,

Welcome to KL 320: History of Christianity.

I regret that I am not here personally today to welcome you but on the Feast of the Assumption I had to fly to Europe to be present at a meeting of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission.

Our first class together will be on Monday, September 12th. At that time please have completed in writing the answers to the questions which are being distributed with this note. Most of the answers you will find easily in the notes entitled "Chronological Survey of New Testament Times (CSNTT)" which will be distributed to you today.

Looking forward to seeing you on Monday!

In Christ,
H. J. Ryan, S.J.

RS 320 Reserve Shelf Books: Themes I + II

221.95 }
A545 } Anderson, B.W., Understanding the Old Testament.
U1975 }

933 }
B274 } Barrett, E.K., The New Testament Background: Selected
K } Documents.

270 }
B279 } Barry, C.J., Readings in Church History.
N V.1 }
C.3 }

270 }
B594 } Bihlmeyer, K., Church History.
C }
V.1 C.1 }

232.8 }
B879 } Brown, R., Jesus God + Man.
J2 }

232 }
B886 } Bruce, F.F., Jesus and Christian Origins Outside
J } the New Testament.

232.8 }
D883 } Dulles, A., Apologetics and the Biblical Christ.
a }

229 } Hennecke, E., New Testament Apocrypha.
5358 }
K

220.6 } Hyatt, J. P., (Editor for Society of Biblical Literature),
5678 } The Bible in Modern Scholarship.
K

229 } James, M. R. (Translator), The Apocryphal New
528 } Testament.
a

270 } Jedin, H. (Editor), Handbook of Church History.
544 }
K
V.1

933 } Josephus, Against Apion.
585 }
J

933 } Jones, A. H. M., The Herods of Judaea.
576 }
K

270 } LaSalette, K. L., A History of the Expansion of Christianity.
L359 }
hi
V.1

270 } LaSalette, K. L., A History of Christianity.
L359 }
K

221.44 } Henry, L., The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early
M 936 } Church.
d

GR }
221.48 } Rahlfs, A., Septuaginta.
B 582 }
A
VI

221.48 } Swete, H. B. & Otley, R. L., An Introduction to the
S 975 } Old Testament in Greek.
i

270 }
W 186 } Walker, W., A History of the Christian Church.
K-1970 }
In this book from page 561 and following there is an excellent bibliography of the whole field of Christian Church History. It is helpful to check this bibliography against that contained in H. Chadwick, The Early Church, pages 290+ following.

281.1 }
W 672 } Wilde, R., The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek
t } Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries.

221.44 } Zeitlin, S., The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern
Z 48 } Scholarship.
d }

A. Ryan, SJ

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY OF NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

Bibliography:

- Abel, F.-M., Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe (Etudes Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1952), I, 108-505; II, 1-102.
- *Bevan, E., Jerusalem Under the High Priests (London: Longmans, 1952).
- *Bickermann, E., The Maccabees (New York: Schocken Books, 1947)
- *Foerster, W., Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte (Hamburg: Im-Furche) I (Das Judentum Palästinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel; [3rd ed.; 1959]); II (Das römische Weltreich zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments [1st ed.; 1956]).
- *Jeremias, J., Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte (2nd. ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u.R., 1958).
- *Jones, A. H. M., The Herods of Judea (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938).
- McKenzie, J. L., "The Jewish World in New Testament Times," in A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (ed. by B. Orchard et al.; London: T. Nelson, 1953), pp. 728-41.
- *Moore, G. F., Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927-30).
- *Noth, M., History of Israel (revised tr. from 2nd German ed; London: A. & C. Beack, 1960), pp. 357-452.
- *Oesterly, W. O. E., A History of Israel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), II, 217-463.
- *Pfeiffer, R. H., A History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: Harper, 1949), pp. 5-59.
- Ricciotti, G., History of Israel (tr. by C. della Penta and R.T.A. Murphy; Milwaukee: Bruce, 1955), II, 236-461.
- Vaux, R. de, "Israel," DBS 4, col. 771-777.
- *Perowne, S., Life and Times of Herod the Great (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959).
- *Perowne, S., The Later Herods: the Political Background of the New Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958)
- *Schürer, E., Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (4th ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901-11). English translation of second German edition: A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (tr. by J. MacPherson; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898-1905), 3 vols. in six parts.

[The following survey does not aim to be a history of NT]
 [times, but rather a chronological skeleton of the period]
 [which may serve to orientate further reading in this]
 [period. It is a sketch mainly of the political events]
 [as they have a bearing on the various religious movements]
 [which provide a background for the rise of Christianity]
 [in Palestine. But a brief description of the main groups of]
 [Jews has been included. This sketch should be used in conjunc-]
 [tion with the article of J. L. McKenzie mentioned in the biblio-]
 [graphy.]

After the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B. C. his world-kingdom broke up, passing into the hands of several generals of his army. The two most significant dynasties which were formed were the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Syria. Palestine came at first under the dominion of the Ptolemies, but the Seleucid ruler, Antiochus III the Great, gained control of it in 198 B. C.

The last really important king of the Seleucid line was Antiochus IV Epiphanes, in whose reign the Maccabean revolt took place. Our sources for this period are mainly the books of Maccabees and Flavius Josephus (c. 37-c.95 A.D.) in his De Bello Judaico and Antiquitates Judaicae.

175-164: Antiochus IV Epiphanes: succeeded his brother, Seleucus IV Philopator, to the Seleucid throne on the assassination of the latter. Antiochus had been educated at Rome, where he was kept as a hostage by the Roman government, which was trying to keep his father Antiochus III in tow. At Rome he developed an ardent enthusiasm for Greek religion, philosophy and culture; these Hellenistic influences were mixed with certain ideas about the absolute, god-like monarch which were derived from his oriental background. Having ousted Heliodorus, the usurper of the Seleucid throne and assassin of his brother, he became king and continued vigorously the policy of the Hellenization of his empire which had been instituted by Alexander. The latter founded Greek colonies, emphasized the polis as a political and cultural center, erected gymnasia, agorai, stadia, theatres, hippodromes, etc. in an effort to make Greek philosophy, religion and literature prevalent in that part of the world. All of this was continued by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who sought for a unity of culture and religion within his realm. The pursuit of the latter naturally brought him into conflict with the Jews in Palestine. The general process of Hellenization was met with great enthusiasm by many Jews, especially in the circle of the aristocratic priesthood. 2Macc 4.14ff. records how enamoured of Hellenism many of the priests were. Since the time of Ezra (late fifth century) post-exilic Judaism had acquired a rather monolithic and normative character. But due to the influx of Hellenistic ideas rifts began to appear, which came to the fore in the Maccabean period. For there were groups that violently opposed Antiochus.

A struggle for the office of High-Priest was also developing at this time. Onias III had been the High-Priest under Seleucus IV, the predecessor of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but was forced to relinquish the office by his brother

Jason, because Onias was pro-Egyptian. Both were of Zadokite priestly descent, but Jason offered the Seleucid Antiochus IV rich gifts and promised a vigorous promotion of Hellenism in Jerusalem, if appointed the High-Priest (2Macc 4.7). This intervention of a monarch in the succession of the High-Priest was unheard of and caused no end of concern in the Jewish community. Three years afterward Menelaos, a member of the priestly family of Tobiards, succeeded in winning the king's favor with still larger sums; the precedent had now been set and the rival priestly families exploited it. The ensuing fight for the High-Priest's office was chaotic. Finally, in 169 Antiochus IV reinstated Menelaos and walked off with the Temple treasury to solve his financial problems.

While on a campaign against Egypt in 168 B. C., Antiochus IV Epiphanes was forced into a humiliating retreat by a Roman commander, Pompilius Laenas. According to some historians, it was in consequence of this humiliation that Antiochus IV sought to vent his enraged feelings on the Jews by deciding to eliminate Judaism completely from his realm. The Torah was abolished; circumcision became a crime punishable by death; the temple-cult was forbidden; an altar to Zeus Olympios (= the Abomination of Desolation) was erected in the precincts of the Jerusalem Temple, while another to Zeus Xenios was set up on the Samaritan Mt. Garizim.

167: The Maccabean Revolt began when the envoy of the Seleucid king arrived at a little village northwest of Jerusalem, called Modin, and demanded worship of Zeus from the inhabitants. He was slain by Mattathias, of the priestly family of Yoyarib, a descendant of the patriarch Hashmon. The elderly Mattathias was the father of five sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar and Jonathan, several of whom became leaders in the Revolt and formed the Hasmonaeen (from Hashmon) dynasty. The third son, Judas, was given the name Maqqabai ("hammer-like"), which in time spread to other members of his family and eventually even to all those who took part in the revolt (including the seven martyrs of 2Macc 7). After the killing of the envoy Mattathias fled with his sons to the mountains, leaving behind all his property. When the father died in 166, Judas became the real leader of the party. In connection with this revolt we learn for the first time of a certain group of Jews, called the Asidaioi in Greek, the Hasidim in Hebrew, "the pious." They were "zealous for the law" and fought on the side of the Maccabees.

165: Hanukkāh: After several defeats the Seleucid king had to come to terms with Judas Maccabee and signed a treaty abrogating the abolition of Judaism. On the 25th of the month Kislev 165 B. C. the Temple was again dedicated (Hanukkāh = "dedication"), three years to a day from its profanation. The yearly feast in December, called "Lights" by Josephus, recalls the memory of this rededication of the Temple under the Maccabees.

The subsequent history of the Macabees is the story of the decay of the old legitimate line of Zadokite priests and the rise of the vigorous new dynasty of the Hasmonaeans. Once Antiochus had interfered to upset the Zadokite line, it was possible for a new priestly family to get in. At first, the Hasmonaeen priests were only acknowledged as de facto holders of the office, but in time even a de iure legitimacy was accorded to them.

It was out of this period of the attempted Hellenization of the Jews and of their struggle to resist it that several types of Jews emerge. It is at this time that we hear of Hasidim, Sadducees, Pharisees and Essenes -- the last three being referred to by Josephus as three philosophiai in his attempts to explain the groups to his Greek and Roman contemporaries.

Hasidim: Very little is known about them beyond what has already been mentioned; a religious group of Jews, "zealous for the law", who first appear in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and who fought on the side of the Maccabees at first, but later broke off from them when the Maccabean movement became decidedly political and less and less religious. The Hasidim are usually regarded as the forerunners of the Pharisees, but with the added information at our disposal about the Essenes from the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls it now seems more likely that they were the forerunners of the Essenes. Of course, it is not impossible that they were the forerunners of both groups.

Sadducees: The Saddukaioi were a priestly group, most likely descended from the line of Zadok. This legitimate line of priests, who served in the Jerusalem Temple and whence came the High-Priests (see 2 Sam 2.26 [ousting of Abiathar]), was the group apparently most influenced by Hellenism in late Judaism. Though a priestly group, they give the impression of having been much more like a political party (though it is very difficult to determine if they had any real political platform). Proud of their Zadokite origins, they opposed the Hasmonaean High-Priests and their group takes shape in the Maccabean era. They apparently were represented by the aristocrats and formed the majority in the Sanhedrin. In Seleucid times they were the Hellenizers, but when the Romans took over Palestine they courted the favor of the new rulers as well. The Sadducees were not heterodox, for they emphasized the Torah. In some matters of penal law and levitical prescriptions they were even stricter than the Pharisees. But they rejected the binding force of oral tradition, of the "Sayings of the Fathers", those interpretations of the written Torah, which had grown up in the course of late Judaism. They likewise rejected the Pharisaic ideas on angelology and resurrection of the dead. Josephus says that they also denied Divine Providence and freedom of the will, but this detail has been questioned by historians. Their conservative ideas were due in the main to their secular outlook and lack of interest in religious questions. It seems, too, that they opposed the Pharisees in small matters (like the reckoning of the new moon feast, Pentecost and the rites of Yom Kippur). Their influence fluctuated with the times and rulers: they became strong toward the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus and enjoyed some favor in the time of Aristobulus II, but in strict NT times, though they still had influence, they were not as powerful as the Pharisees.

Pharisees: The Pharisaioi were the "Separated Ones" (- Aram. pārîšâyê, Hebr. perûšîm) -- the name was most likely given to them by adversaries (probably because of their strict observance of all the prescriptions of the Torah and its oral interpretation). In their Rabbinical writings they are called h^abərîm, "comrades."

They were basically a religious, not a political movement, a lay, not a sacerdotal, group, whose influence among the Jewish people lay in their piety and their knowledge and learning. Their aim: everyone in Israel should achieve

holiness through the study of the Torah (which included its oral interpretations); they sought "to raise up many disciples." Piety was teachable in their view. According to E. Bickermann (The Maccabees, 94), this was clearly a Hellenistic idea transferred to Judaism: that education could so transform the individual and the entire people that the nation would be capable of the divine task set before it. To become a holy nation was the goal of all Jews, but to do this by education was the Pharisaic contribution.

Their origin is obscure; scholars have often related them to the Hasîdîm. But Schürer and Lagrange point out that they first appear as an organized group in the time of John Hyrcanus I (135-104). They were persecuted by him toward the end of his reign and also by Alexander Jannaeus; but they enjoyed the favor of Salome Alexandra.

Regarding their tenets, they accepted the "Sayings of the Fathers" (oral tradition) with equal validity and obligation as the written Torah itself. This oral tradition was made up of the additional regulations derived from the written Law by the Scribes; these additions were conceived of as "fences built around the Law" to protect it. Hence all precepts of the Law (written as well as oral) were imposed as equally grave. They believed in the existence of angels, the resurrection of the dead, the freedom of man's will under the control of divine providence. About 200 A.D. their oral interpretations were codified in the Mishnah, the core of the Talmud.

It was Pharisaism which imposed its permanent stamp on Judaism. The Sadducees and the Essenes disappeared from Jewish history sometime after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 A. D.), but the Pharisees persist today. This is mainly due to the religious motivation of the movement. The care for the observance of the Law and the opposition to the often rapacious priesthood gave them much influence among the common people. When the liturgy of the Temple disappeared with the destruction of Jerusalem, the Pharisaic or legalistic type of Judaism prevailed. The attitude of the Evangelists toward them is one of hostility, portraying them as hypocrites. A certain amount of hypocrisy did exist in Pharisaism, but there have been attempts in recent times to show them in a better light. By appealing to rabbinical writings and to Josephus, scholars have shown that their motivation was often quite religious. This is the force which was evident in Paul, who despite his radical break with Pharisaic Judaism was still proud of that background. The difficulty with it was that it went to extremes and often terminated in hypocrisy.

Essenes: The Greek name Essênoi or Essaioi, compounded from a Semitic stem related to hasyā, "pious, devout," and a Greek adjectival ending, is one of the reasons for relating this group of Jews to the Hasîdîm. They are called in the Dead Sea Scrolls the benê Šaddûq, "the sons of Zadok." Burrows (More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 257): "It is generally agreed and may be assumed without further discussion that the roots of the Qumran sect go down into the movement of the Hasidim of Maccabaeian times." The identification of the Essenes with sect of Qumran depends on a notice in Pliny the Elder, Natural History 5.15 [73], who locates the Essenes between Jericho and the town of En Gedi on the western shore of the Dead Sea; the only area that they could have occupied is the excavated site of Qumran.

From their documents it appears that they were of priestly stock, broke off from the Jerusalem priesthood (Sadducee ?), and were led by a Righteous Teacher out to a desert retreat ca. 150 B. C. There they established a sort of

monastic life, owning all things in common, eating in common, praying in common. Actually they were anchorites, living in caves and huts about the communal center, to which they came for community exercises. They practised celibacy (at least in the early stages of their movement), ritual washings, and a general ascetism. Candidates had to go through a probation of three years; their day was spent in manual labor and the study of the Torah and the Prophets. The community was organized with a mebaqqer ("superintendent", meaning exactly what the Greek episkopos means) at their head and also a council of twelve lay men and three priests. They are not mentioned in the NT (possibly because they were closest in ideas and outlook to the early Church and not so violently antagonistic as the Pharisees and Sadducees). All trace of them is lost after 70 A. D. Were they assumed into some Jewish Christian group (Ebionites?) or into orthodox Judaism?

[Some basic books on the Qumran Sect of Essenes:]
 [Burrows, M., The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking,]
 [1955; More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York:]
 [Viking, 1958; Milik, J. T., Ten Years of Discovery in]
 [the Wilderness of Judaea (Studies in Biblical Theology]
 [26; Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1959); Cross, F. M.,]
 [The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical]
 [Studies (New York: Doubleday, 1958); Ploeg, J. van der,]
 [The Excavations at Qumran (London: Longmans, Green, 1958)]

The preceding sketch of the main groups of Jews which came into being at various stages during the Maccabean period has been a digression from the chronological survey itself. But a notice of them is as important to the understanding of the NT period as the chronological skeleton itself.

Out of this struggle was also born the apocalyptic movement or the period of apocalyptic literature. It is the development of a type of literature that begins to appear embryonically in the canonical prophets (Is 24-27; Joel; Zach 9-14; Ezek). In its final redaction Daniel dates from this Maccabean period and is the first full-blown apocalypse (c. 167-63 B. C.). The genre continues to appear in NT times in the Apocalypse, the apocalyptic sermons to the Synoptics (Mk 13 and par.), certain passages in Paul, and abundantly in the apocrypha of the OT and the NT. An apocalypse is composed as a revelation of secrets hidden away in the distant past and just recently discovered; it is studiously mysterious, cloaking an interpretation of contemporary events in obscure names, figures and symbols. The events can sometimes be identified by modern scholars, but more often they remain in their obscurity. An apocalypse is persecution-literature and its rise in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is easily understood. Written at a time when it was believed that inspired prophecy had long since died out, the apocalypse was intended to bolster up the hopes of the nation by presenting in symbolic fashion the intervention of the mighty hand of Yahweh to rescue the faithful. "God is with the orthodox." Yahweh is the supreme lord of history and will intervene in its course on the side of those who are faithful to him and will rescue them from their oppressors. Heathen nations will be destroyed; sinners will be punished; evil will disappear from the face of the earth; the faithful will be rewarded with life everlasting in the Jewish kingdom of God. This is a development of the Messianic hopes expressed in vaguer terms in the prophetic books of the OT.

The subsequent history of the Maccabean revolt is the story of the decay of the Hasmonaean dynasty.

164: Antiochus V Eupator: ascended the throne as an eight year old boy on the death of his father; a regent Lysias ruled in fact. Despite the victories of Judas Maccabee the Seleucids continued to keep a garrison in Jerusalem and throughout Palestine. Menelaus was removed as High-Priest, probably as a result of the newly accorded privilege to reorganize the cult in the Temple. No successor, however, was immediately named.

162: Demetrios I Soter: ascended the Seleucid throne, after having instigated the murder of Antiochus V Eupator and the regent, Lysias. In the hope of restoring peace among the Jews and reducing their unrest, he appointed as High-Priest Alcimus, a Sadducee and at heart a Hellenizer. Most of the Jews were resigned to accept the situation of foreign domination and foreign appointment of the High Priest, as long as they were able to worship Yahweh in some peace. But it now appeared that Judas M. and his followers were aiming as well at complete political independence and the complete elimination of foreign domination. The revolt had begun as a struggle against the Seleucid king's despotism; all the orthodox Jews had rallied to the cause. But now the Maccabean movement was becoming clearly political and a division in the ranks of the orthodox appeared. The Hasidim broke with the Maccabees. They were interested in living according to the Torah and in worshipping Yahweh; as long as they could do this, they were not interested in political freedom; they were content to await the day of Yahweh and his deliverance and the establishment of the theocracy of old. Moreover, they refused to support Alcimus, the Sadducee, who had betrayed them (1Macc 7.13; 2Macc 14.6).

161: Jonathan: succeeded Judas Maccabee as leader of the movement. At first he functioned as a judge at Michmash in the mountains and was a good charismatic leader. About 153 he was wooed by the Seleucid Alexander Balas and allowed himself to be made the High-Priest and eventually rex socius (or Ethnarch). According to Milik and many others, Jonathan best fits the description of the "Wicked Priest" of the Qumran texts, who persecuted the Righteous Teacher and the Essenes. The latter are mentioned for the first time by Josephus in the time of Jonathan and it is likely that the break between them and the Jerusalem priests ensued c. 150 B. C., after which they withdrew to their desert retreat at Qumran. The archaeological evidence of Khirbet Qumran, supported by copper coins (15 from the time of John Hyrcanus I and 86 from the time of Alexander Jannaeus -- from the time of settled occupation there), points to the beginning of the sect's occupation of Qumran c. 150. The palaeographical study of the manuscripts and fragments points also to the same period. Such evidence seems to preclude a later date in the second century for the beginning of the Qumran sect (e. g., under John Hyrcanus or Alexander Jannaeus). But it must be admitted that it is also possible that Jonathan's successor, Simon, was the Wicked Priest and that the foundation was made in his time. A later date, however, seems out of the question. -- Jonathan later incurred the wrath of the Seleucid king Demetrios II in trying to throw off the foreign yoke and rid the land of the Seleucid garrisons. He was tricked into going to Ptolemais, where he was captured and put to death.

143: Simon: the brother of Jonathan became the head of the Hasmonaeans. He too began as a good charismatic leader, winning from the Seleucid Demetrios II freedom from tithe duty and a general amnesty. But in the course of time he too behaved more and more like an independent ruler; with the consent

of the people he gave himself the title of "Great High Priest, general and leader of the Jews" (1Macc 13.42). The decree in 1Macc 14.41-7 recognized him as the High Priest de iure and effectively transferred the legitimate priestly line from the Zadokite to the Hasmonaeen dynasty. He continued the fortification of Jerusalem begun under Jonathan and built many fortresses throughout the land. But he and his two sons were murdered by Ptolemaios, the son-in-law of Simon, at Dok, a camp on the top of Quruntal (a mount near Jericho; the "traditional" site of the Temptation of Christ).

134: John Hyrcanus I: John, another son of Simon, the Governor of Gazara, escaped the fate of his father and brothers and became the Hasmonaeen leader. At first he was kept in tow by a more vigorous than usual Seleucid king, Antiochus VII Sidetes, but when the latter died (128 B. C.), he declared himself High Priest and Ethnarch and became the first really independent Hasmonaeen ruler. Military victories and the minting of coins (which bore the inscription "The High Priest John and the community of the Jews") marked his career. He dreamt of restoring the kingdom of David and Saul. The Pharisees are mentioned for the first time in his reign; he was benevolent toward them, but toward the end of his reign he persecuted them. During this persecution some of them apparently went off and joined the Essenes, which accounts for the introduction of some Pharisaic elements into the Qumran sect at a certain point in their development. In 104 John Hyrcanus died, leaving a will in which he stated that his wife was to succeed him, but his son, Aristobulus I, seized power, imprisoned his mother and brothers, and declared himself High Priest and King. But he was shortlived.

103: Alexander Jannaeus: the brother of Aristobulus, became High Priest and King on the death of the latter. His real name was Jonathan and his nick-name was Jannai, to which he added the Greek name Alexander; whence the usual form of the name given him in history. He was actually made king by Salome Alexandra, the wife of Aristobulus, who also married him. The Decline of the Hasmonaeen dynasty really sets in under him, for his reign was marked by fraternal strife. He waged many wars with varying success against the Nabataean kingdom in Transjordan, but his people opposed his militarism and even invoked the aid of the Seleucid Demetrios III Eukairos against him. In retaliation he crucified some 800 Jews. The Pharisees opposed him, mainly because of his lack of descent from the Davidic or Aaronitic lines. He died in his 51st year in 76 BC.

76: Salome Alexandra: the wife of Alexander Jannaeus, becomes the head of the Hasmonaeen dynasty. She was an energetic and shrewd woman, who retained the regal power, but as a woman could not be the High Priest. She made her son, Hyrcanus II, the High Priest and tried to repress her younger son, Aristobulus, who was favored by the Sadducees. She herself accorded favor to the Pharisees. She ruled until 67, and then strife between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus marks the period until the Romans appear on the scene.

63: Pompey takes Jerusalem: Having defeated Mithridates of Pontus and Tigranes of Armenia in 66 BC, Pompey sent his legate M. Aemilius Scaurus into Syria to liquidate the Seleucid empire. Hearing of the strife between Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, the legate proceeded to Jerusalem and favored Aristobulus. Pompey himself arrived in Syria in the winter of 64, and

after wintering there moved from Damascus to Jerusalem in the spring of 63. He took Aristobulus captive, took over the city of Jerusalem and entered the "Holy of Holies". This was not a desecration of the Temple like the "Abomination of Desolation", but it was a source of concern to the Jews. Hyrcanus II was again made High Priest, while Aristobulus formed part of Pompey's triumphus in Rome in 61 BC. Pompey reorganized Palestine and Syria into the provincia Syriae, politically ruled by Rome. The High-Priest had dominion only over those areas where the people recognized his authority and his cult (Jerusalem, Judaea, Peraea, Galilee, southern part of Samaria, upper part of Idumaea). There was peace for a while in Palestine as a result of the Roman reorganization. But the Roman rule brought misery too, since M. Licinius Crassus plundered the province in 54 B. C. and robbed the Temple treasury in 53.

49: Julius Caesar: crossed the Rubicon and became a threat to Pompey's power; the latter retired to the East. After the battle of Pharsalus in 48, when Pompey was defeated, there was much courting of Caesar's favor by Hyrcanus and his followers and opponents. Because he had helped Caesar in Egypt by persuading the Alexandrian Jews to side with him, Hyrcanus was rewarded with the title of Ethnarch by Caesar who arrived in Syria in 47; his high-priesthood was confirmed and he and his offspring were to be known as socii populi Romani. Hyrcanus had a friend, Antipater the Idumaeen, who was also honored by Caesar, who bestowed on him the title civis romanus and made his two sons stratēgoi (governors), Phasaël of Peraea, and Herod of Galilee. In 44 Caesar was assassinated. The assassins came to the East; one of them was the former quaestor of Syria, C. Cassius Longinus, who was made governor of the province, which he proceeded to plunder. Antipater courted his favor, for which the Jerusalemites poisoned him. This left Hyrcanus again alone in power in Jerusalem. As a reward for the aid given to him in defeating Antigonus, the upstart son of Aristobulus, Hyrcanus gave Mariamne, the Hasmonaeen granddaughter of Aristobulus and the daughter of Alexander, to the Idumaeen Herod in marriage. This was a union of the Hasmonaeans and the Idumaeans (the latter were never considered more than half-Jews by the orthodox).

50: Parthian Invasion of the Province of Syria: The Parthians, who invaded the province, supported Antigonus, captured Phasaël and Hyrcanus by a ruse, but did not succeed in taking Herod. Hyrcanus was turned over to Antigonus as a prisoner and his ears were cut off (thus making him incapable of functioning as the High-Priest in the future because of the impediment of mutilation). Herod went to Rome and sought the favor at first of Antony and then of Octavian; a senatusconsultum declared him "King of Judaea", but he had yet to conquer his own kingdom. This took three years to do.

37: Herod the Great: became the undisputed master in Palestine with the aid of Roman troops. He was a clever politician, who at first favored Antony, but after Actium (31 BC) visited Octavian on the island of Rhodes and in a theatrical gesture laid his crown at the victor's feet; Octavian returned it to Herod's head with his own hands. Herod was famed for his building activity: built Samaria (called Sebaste [Greek equivalent of Augustus] in honor of the Emperor), Strato's Tower (Caesarea); erected Herodian fortresses throughout Palestine; he enclosed the sacred precinct of Mamre (at Ramet el-Halil) and began the reconstruction of the Temple at Jerusalem in 20 BC which was only completed in 62 AD, some eight years before it was to be destroyed by the Romans.

But Herod never succeeded in gaining the full support of the Jews; he was a "half-Jew" in their eyes because of his Idumaeon background. By the Romans he was hailed as "the Great", because he carried out in the East the great cultural plans of Augustus. He was a rex socius, enjoying full autonomy and freedom from tribute, but subservient to Rome in matters of foreign relations and war. He surrounded himself with men trained in Greek rhetoric and philosophy, engaged Nicholas of Damascus as his secretary (the latter's 144 volumes of universal history were used by Josephus for the biography of Herod). His last years were embittered by domestic strife and court intrigues for he had ten wives, among whom Mariamne (with her sons) caused most of the trouble. He died at Jericho in 4 B. C. and was buried in a magnificent tomb atop an artificial mound called Herodium (modern Jebel Fureidis, which looks today like a small volcano with open crater from a distance), situated a few miles east of Bethlehem.

ca. 6 B. C.: Birth of Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ. The birth is set by Luke in the days of Herod (cf. 2.1 with 1.5 and Mt 2.1). The "Christian or Common Era" is the mode of dating, which is supposed to have its point de départ in the Incarnation and the Birth of Christ. As a matter of fact, it is based on a miscalculation made by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian monk and abbot of a monastery in Rome, who rebelled against the then prevailing system of dating from the time of Diocletian ("...nolumus circulis nostris memoriam impii et persecutoris innectere" Ep. ad Petron. 61; PL 67. 487). He introduced the current practice ca. 527 AD. Equating the year A. D. 1 with 754 A. U. C., he introduced an error of about four years, for he computed the beginning of Augustus' reign as 727 A. U. C., the year in which Octavian assumed that title. But his reign was usually computed from the battle of Actium in 732 A. U. C. Part of Dionysius' calculation was based on L 3.23 and 3.1, which situate the beginning of Christ's public life in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. Augustus died in 767 A. U. C. and the fifteenth year of Tiberius, his successor, would coincide with 783 A.U.C. Dionysius argued that Christ was 30 years old (as he read the text!) in that year and so would have been born in 754 A.U.C. This became the year 1. We know that Herod died in 750 A.U.C., which would correspond roughly to 4 B. C. Josephus (Ant. 17.8,1; JW 1.33,8) says that Herod died 37 years after his recognition by the Triumvirate in Rome, which occurred in 714 A.U.C. (Ant. 14.14,5) and 34 years after his actual assumption of power in 717 A. U. C. These yield 750 as date of death ($714 + 37 - 1 = 750$). [For the problems which this dating causes, the interpretation of the census of Quirinius see exegesis class and notes on L 2.]

4 BC: Archelaus, Herod Antipas, Philip: According to Herod's will his kingdom was to be divided up among his sons: Archelaus became the king of Judaea, Antipas the tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea, and Philip the tetrarch of Trachonitis, Batanaea and Gaulanitis. Archelaus was the least liked of Herod's sons, for he arbitrarily removed High-Priests and despite his extensive building operations and munificence a delegation of noblemen from Jerusalem and Samaria finally complained to Rome of his misgovernment and he was exiled to Vienne in southern Gaul in A. D. 6. Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea, was a shrewd and clever character, "the fox" (L 13.32), at once vainglorious and indolent. He married Herodias, the former wife of his half-brother, Herod Philip (Mk 6.17 par.), after he had repudiated his own first wife, the daughter of the Nabataean king, Aretas IV, who engaged in guerilla warfare against him. The Roman governor of the Province of Syria, Vitellius, was supposed to help him in this warfare, but did not and he was defeated by Aretas in A. D. 37. Caligula (emperor in 37) finally exiled him to

Lyons in AD 39. Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, Batanaea, Auranitis, Gaulinitis and Panias, was often praised for his justice and benevolence toward his subjects. He built Caesarea Philippi near one of the sources of the Jordan. At his death in 34 his territory was incorporated into the Roman province of Syria.

AD 6: P. Sulpicius Quirinius: as legate of Syria and after the exile of Archelaus instituted the rule of the Roman procuratores Iudaeae. The first procurator was Coponius. Josephus tells us that Quirinius took up a census "in the 37th year of Caesar's victory over Antony at Actium" (= year beginning 2 Sept. AD 6).

AD 14: Death of Augustus: He had been proclaimed Imperator in 27 BC and instituted a policy of pax Romana throughout his empire, which persisted long after his death in the Mediterranean world. He died on 19 August AD 14, and Tiberius was formally proclaimed emperor within less than one month on 17 September. The first regnal year of Tiberius then began.

AD 26: Pontius Pilate: Coponius, the first procurator of Judaea (probably from AD 6-9), was succeeded by Marcus Ambivius (probably AD 9-12), Annius Rufus (prob. AD 12-15), Valerius Gratus (AD 15-26) and then by Pontius Pilate (AD 26-36). In a letter to the Emperor Caligula, Herod Agrippa I judged the latter to be "of nature inflexible, and, owing to stubbornness, harsh" (Philo, Leg. ad Gaium 38). He violated the sensibilities of the Jews by smuggling into Jerusalem by night military insignia bearing the emperor's image; he had to remove them when the Jews showed themselves ready to die than tolerate such a violation of the Decalogue. They even forced him to remove from Herod's palace some golden shields inscribed with the Emperor's name. He used Temple funds to build an aqueduct for Jerusalem and had on one occasion to disperse a mob by force that protested against him. He brought about his downfall by harshness, falling upon large crowds of credulous Samaritans, who had gathered to witness the discovery of sacred objects allegedly hidden by Moses on Mt. Garizim (AD 35).

AD 28: The fifteenth year of Tiberius began in the fall of this year. Ministry of John the Baptist and the beginning of the Public Life of Christ.

ca. AD 30: Death of Christ

AD 36: Vitellius, legatus Syriae, sent Pilate to Rome to account for his actions. Absence of Procurator may have been occasion for the Jewish rising against the Christians during which Stephen was martyred and in connection with which Paul was converted.

AD 37: Caligula: proclaimed Emperor; he tried to impose Emperor worship throughout his empire. Herod Agrippa, the brother of the jealous Herodias, was appointed tetrarch of Northern Transjordan with the title of King. He tried to have the order of Emperor worship rescinded in his territories. But the Roman Governor of Syria and Egypt saw to the execution of it in many places. The pagans erected a statue to the Emperor in Jamnia on the southern coast, and Jews destroyed it. Incidents occurred throughout Palestine. Philo was sent in the year 40 on a legation to the Emperor to plead the cause of the Jews of Alexandria against the edict of emperor worship. But the whole issue was eventually solved by the murder of Caligula in 41.

AD 41: Claudius: became Emperor and rewarded Herod Agrippa for his support of Roman rule in his territory by extending it to Judaea, Idumaea and Samaria. The famous third wall of the city of Jerusalem was begun in the time of Herod Agrippa, who was in general a pious ruler, observing strictly the prescriptions of the Pharisees. He died in AD 44 in Caesarea, while attending the Vicennalia, games in honor of the Emperor. But he had instituted a persecution of the Christians (A 12.1-19). About the year AD 46 there was a serious famine under Claudius which affected this part of the world (in the time of the procurator Tiberius Alexander [46-48]).

AD 49: "The Council of Jerusalem": probably in the summer of this year. About the same time occurred the edict of Claudius expelling the Jews (and Christians?) from Rome.

AD 52: M. Antonius Felix: Became procurator Judaeae. Under him we learn of the mounting of tension and open hostility at times between the Jews and the Romans which inevitably led to the First Jewish Revolt against Rome (66-70). This is apparently the time of the rise of the Zealots (chauvinistic Jews) and of the Sicarii (Zealots armed with sicae). Paul imprisoned for two years by Felix.

AD 54: Nero: proclaimed Emperor.

AD 60: Porcius Festus: governed Judaea for two years as procurator and an able and honest administrator, but the tinderbox situation was apparently beyond the state of any lasting remedy. The rampant corruption of his successor, Albinus (62-64) served only to inflame the feelings of the Jews who might have been somewhat calmed under Festus. It was Festus who sent Paul to Rome to plead his cause before the Emperor.

AD 64-66: Gessius Florus: as procurator he openly plundered the land for his own advantage, by robbing individuals, sacking towns and accepting bribes from bandits. Humiliated over a loss of face in Caesarea, when Nero decided to grant the Gentile portion of the population superior civic rights and the 'Hellenes' hindered access to their synagogue by building shops in front of its entrance, the Jews appealed to G. Florus. He did nothing and later when he stole 17 talents from the Temple treasury, Jerusalem Jews could not contain themselves. In sarcasm they passed around their community a basket to raise a collection for the indigent Florus, who took bloody vengeance on them for the insult, turning over to his soldiers a section of the city for plunder. The High-Priest tried to control the people and counselled them to patience. The meek attitude of the people, who did not react against the soldiers, was interpreted as scorn and the soldiers took up arms. But Rebels soon seized the Temple precincts against the Romans, cut off the porticoed passageway between the Temple and the Fortress Antonia. Florus, who was momentarily not strong enough to check them, had to withdraw to Caesarea. The leader of the rebel forces was Eleazar, aided by Menahem the son of Judas the Galilean, head of the band of Zealots. The rebels now organized the land for the battle: Galilee was entrusted to Joseph, son of Matthias (the historian Josephus), but John of Gishala, a leader of the Galilean Zealots, suspected Josephus of being disloyal and tried to get rid of him on several occasions. Josephus only barely

escaped and later handed himself over to Vespasian, the trusty Field Commander of the Emperor Nero, was sent out to Palestine and began his preparations in Antioch in the winter of 66-67. By the following winter Galilee had fallen to the Romans; the 5th and 15th legions wintered at Caesarea, the 10th at Scythopolis. Meanwhile aid was sought by the Jews from Idumaea, but the Idumaeans soon realized that the situation was hopeless and withdrew. About this time the early Christian community withdrew from Jerusalem for the Decapolis, settling mostly in Pella. In the spring of 68 Vespasian advanced toward Jerusalem, via the Jordan valley, seizing and burning rebellious headquarters (Samaria, Jericho, Peraea, Machaerus, Qumran, etc.). On the 9 June AD 68 Nero died and Vespasian halted his activity to see what would develop in Rome.

AD 68-70: Siege of Jerusalem: Civil war had in the meantime broken out in Jewish quarters. Simon bar Giora, the leader of a band, rode through the land, plundering what the Romans had left. He finally turned toward the Zealots in Jerusalem. The people, tired of the Tyranny of the Zealot John of Gishala, welcomed the new leader. John of G. withdrew to the Temple precincts, and Simon bar G. ruled in the city itself. This was the spring of 69. In June AD 69 Vespasian attacked the city (Galba had become Emperor in Rome, but was murdered in Jan. AD 69 and was succeeded by Otho, who was soon to be replaced by Vitellius; the latter's reign lasted only until Dec. AD 69, when the troops in the East proclaimed Vespasian as Emperor.). He returned to Rome in 70, leaving behind his son, Titus, to continue the siege of Jerusalem. This was re-opened in the spring of 70 with four legions and numerous mercenary troops. Titus encamped on Mt. Scopus (hill to the northeast of Jerusalem) about Passover; Jerusalem was accessible only from the north, but was heavily defended by three rings of walls. Riots ensued at Passover within the city in the sight of the Roman troops; but the Jews soon united in face of the common enemy. Titus threw up circumvallatio, crucified in the sight of defenders all who tried to flee the besieged city. Hunger and thirst began to tell. In July the Fortress of Antonia was set afire and entered, whence Titus could make his way into the Temple. He wanted to spare the latter, but demanded surrender as its price. The people refused; fire was set to the gates, and soon it spread to the whole Temple. Massacre ensued. Titus entered the Holy of Holies and Roman standards were set up in the enclosure. John of Gishala withdrew to the Palace of Herod, and once more siege was set. In Sept. AD 70 the city was finally taken, plundered and razed. The walls were torn down except for a few spots near Herod's palace, the bases of whose towers still stand today. A Roman garrison was stationed in the city. John of Gishala, Simon bar Giora and the seven-branched candlestick of the Temple formed part of Titus' triumphal procession in Rome (see the representations on the Arch of Titus in Roman forum). Small strongholds of Jews (Herodium, Masada, Machaerus) were not wiped out until AD 72. -- The central sanctuary was no more; sacrifice could not be offered. The office of High Priest was gone. Synagogues became the rallying points for Jews after 70, in which the Pharisaic Rabbis tried to keep Jews faithful to the Torah. Synod of Jamnia in 90 settled the Canon.

There were elements in the land who still dreamt of a restoration, like that which followed the Babylonian exile and the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC. We know little of what happened in Palestine to the Jews after 70. The Flavian Emperors were not friendly to them. Trajan (Emperor 98-117) must have taken some measures against them, for there were some revolts, not in Judaea, but in the Diaspora (Egypt and Cyrene), in which thousands died.

AD 117: Hadrian: succeeded Trajan as Emperor; visited the Near East in 130-131.

AD 132-34: Second Jewish Revolt against Rome: The sources for this revolt are basically Dio Cassius (69.12-14) and Eusebius (HE 4.6) and some new material from the caves of the Wadi Murabba'at, but all in all the information is skimpy. The cause of the revolt is not clear: a) On the occasion of Hadrian's trip to the Near East he ordered the establishment of a Roman city, Aelia Capitolina, with a pagan temple dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus, on the ruins of the city and temple of Jerusalem. As long as the Emperor was in the vicinity the Jews were quiet, but once he departed, the storm broke. b) Others assert that Hadrian's law forbidding circumcision was the cause of the revolt. The leader of the revolt was Simon ben Koseba, who was known to the Rabbis of his time who did not approve of his revolt, as ben Koziba ("son of a lie"), but to the great Rabbi Aqiba, who did approve of the movement, as bar Kokheba ("son of the Star"), who applied to him the Messianic oracle of Balaam (Num 24.17). The Jews occupied what little of the city that had been rebuilt, but not for long. Little is known about the war except that bar Kokheba's headquarters were at Bittir and that he had camps at Herodium, Teqoa and in the Wadi Murrabba'at. The revolt broke out in 132 and coins were struck to commemorate the freedom of Israel, "Simon, the prince of Israel" - year 1, year 2. The cult must have been restored, as there is mention of a priest Eleazar on one coin. The Roman governor of Judaea was Tineius Rufus, who did not master the situation. Finally Hadrian sent out Julius Severus, the governor of Britain, to conduct the war against the Jews, who chose not to fight the guerilla bands, but to surround and starve them out. The final stand was made at Khirbet el-Yehûd, about six miles southwest of Jerusalem, near Bittir. Simon died in defence of the place, most likely in 134 or 135. The land was devastated as a result of this revolt; many were killed, countless enslaved. Jerusalem was again razed and a Roman colony settled on it called Colonia Aelia Capitolina. A Temple to Jupiter Capitolinus was erected on the precincts of the Jewish Temple together with an equestrian statue of Hadrian. An agora was built near the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre and at one end a temple of Venus was erected. Palestine, which had become the Roman provincia Judaeae after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 (with coins ignominiously commemorating "Judaea capta"), now lost its name Judaea even and received from the Romans the name Palaestina, an ironic twist which reflects the ancient name of Philistine. No Jew was allowed to dwell there.

What happened to the Christian Church and Christianity during this last period (AD 70-135)? It is very difficult to say. The Jewish Christians of Jerusalem fled to Pella about 68. After 70 some may have returned to the vicinity of Jerusalem. After 135, when Jews were no longer allowed to inhabit the site of Jerusalem, Christians apparently fell under the same ban (being identified as Jews). But it is not unlikely that some Gentile Christians continued to live in the area itself, and perhaps even in the town of Aelia Capitolina.

The fact that Jerusalem was destroyed twice, once in 70 and again in 135, should be kept in mind, when attempts are made to localize various episodes of the life of Christ in the modern city. Moreover, strange as it may seem, we do not find any traces of an interest to localize such episodes and to find the "exact spot" until early Byzantine times (with the coming of Constantine and Helena).

Research Questions Springing from CSNTT: RS 320 (Fr. Ryan, SJ)

1. What is the difference between a 'mystery religion' and an 'historical religion'? In which of these two types of religion would you place Christianity? X
- ② Why do we start a course on the history of Christianity by exploring a Chronological Survey of New Testament Times?
3. Why do we commence the Survey with Antiochus IV Epiphanes? What religious institution of the Hebrews is undermined during the reign of the infamous Seleucid King?
4. Explain the further deterioration of Hebrew religious unity by the rise of factions (Hasidim, Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes). Relate Jesus to these factions.
5. How does one explain the political situation of the Hebrew people in the Holy Land in the centuries immediately prior to Jesus' birth and during his lifetime? What influence does this political situation have on the development of Hebrew religious literature? What is Jesus' attitude to this political situation? How is Jesus' preaching affected by the forms of religious literature of his time?
6. Were the Hebrews satisfied with and proud of their local political leaders during Jesus' lifetime?
7. By Roman law the Hebrew religion was a religio licita, a religion legally permitted. In the light of this fact, why are the years 66-70 a turning point in Christian-Jewish relations?
8. What effect did the Bar Kochbar revolution of 135 have on Christian-Jewish relations? What result did this reversal of Jewish attitudes towards Christians have on non-Jewish Christians? What crisis did this precipitate in the Christian Church?

H. J. Ryan, S.J.

Research Questions Springing from CSNTT: RS 320 B

Joe Bustillos

1. I believe Christianity is a historical religion. I feel this way because my understanding of a mystery religion is a religion founded on one individual's particular revelation on one concept of "truth." Whereas Christianity is an ongoing process by which God from eternal ages has continually unveiled his truth to mankind. Quoting the writer to the Hebrews:

In times past, God spoke in fragmentary and varied ways to our fathers through the prophets; in this, the final age, he has spoken to us through his son, whom he has made heir of all things and through whom he first created the universe.

- Hebrews 1:1-2 (NAB)

A historical religion ~~was~~ was founded in both time and space; As Christianity was.

2. We are going to start a history of Christianity course in New Testament times because that is where Christianity had its start. It has its "roots" in the various traditions of first century Palestine.
3. Following their return from the Babylonian exile the Jews were a united nation. But during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes factions began to grow. Factions sprang up in response to Antiochus' attempts to Hellenize the nation. The Hebrew institution that suffered the most under this king was the High Priesthood.
4. The factions first sprang up over Jews acceptance or rejection of Antiochus' Hellenizing of the nation. The Hasidim were vigorously opposed to Antiochus' attempts to bring Greek culture to the Jews. It is theorized that both the Essenes ("pious, devout ones") and the Pharisees ("separated ones") had their origins in the Hasidim movement. The group most in favor of Antiochus' Hellenizing was the Sadducees. Regarded

the most narrow-minded theologically (accepting only the Pentateuch as Holy Scripture) and the most liberal politically, the Sadducees were composed of the Temple Priests.

5. The Hebrew people lived in a state of foreign occupation. Persecution or Apocalyptic literature grew out of this period. Apocalyptic literature rested on the belief that God was going to redeem his people, the occupying forces were going to be overthrown and that David's Kingdom would be re-established.

Jesus, being a Pharisee, was less concerned with the political situation as he was with the spiritual condition of his people. Jesus incorporated the various forms of religious literature (parable, allegory, apocalyptic, etc.) into his discourses. The Synoptic gospels are in agreement that Jesus' first message was the apocalyptic warning, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand."

6. The Hebrew people, born under the patriarchal tradition, honored their leaders. But since the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes there developed a growing resentment by the people because many of the ruling classes received their position at the hand of a gentile and for a price.
7. In seventy A.D. Jerusalem was leveled and the temple cult abolished. The Jewish people were wretched from their homeland and from now on Judaism would everge from a different direction. In the face of this persecution the Christians fled; following Jesus' instructions according to Matthew chapter 24, Mark chapter 13, and Luke chapter 21. The Jews considered the Nazarean sect as Traitors.
8. I searched through the given notes in the CSNTT, the JBC, and the NCCOHS but I was unable to find enough information to answer the given question properly.

(please turn page over)

8. The Bar Kochba Revolt was a revolt unlike the 70AD. revolt that took place only in Jerusalem. The Bar Kochba Revolt was staged in every major city with a Jewish population simultaneously. The Jews simply began making demands and causing uprisings.

This affected the Jewish/Christian relationships in that the way the revolt was put-down was that troops would go from door to door seeking Jews. If a Christian, being seen as just a member of a Jewish sect, he would be thrown into prison. This began the Christians' hatred toward the Jews.

A crisis in the church occurred when the soldiers knocked on the door of a man named Marcion. In an attempt to keep himself out of prison he denied all Jewish roots in Christianity and left Christianity as some sort of mystical religion.

RS 320: Outline

Theme:

Expansion of Christianity

Canon of S.S.

Development of Ordained Ministry

Christological & Trinitarian dogma & Councils

Emergence of the Primacy of the Roman See

Problem:

Why so rapid?

What criteria?
Why these books?

How is local Church organized?

How is Christianity monotheistic?

How does the whole Church decide?

Tension & Theory

miracle \leftrightarrow mystery religion

Jew of history \leftrightarrow X of faith

Charismatic \leftrightarrow Institutional

Hebraic \leftrightarrow Hellenistic

SS \leftrightarrow Tradition

local \leftrightarrow universal

primal \leftrightarrow patriarchal

Historical Study:

diaspora Judaism
"historical" religion

Origin of NT writings

Which priesthood does the ordained ministry have?

"Personal" End of the Covenant

The Church is a Communion
Communio = Κοινωνία

H. J. Ryan, S.J.

RS 320 History of Christianity I (Fr. Ryan, A.)

I Expansion of Christianity.

A. Hebrew Background:

1. Jewish situation in the "Holy Land":

- a. Political: "tinny box of tension", occupied Temple State since time of Alexander the Great, Ptolemies, Seleucids (Antiochus IV Epiphanes & selling high priestly office Zadokite priesthood flees), Maccabees & consequent corruption of Hasmonean dynasty, Roman conquest: disaffection of common people *am ha'ares* (people of the land) with high priesthood & Akkadian's family.
 - b. Economic: agrarian economy, trade route between Egypt and Mesopotamia population (600,000) estimate of Josephus, Jerusalem 65,000 taxes: Roman (tithes, sales, imports) and Temple = 40% income
 - c. Religious: Monotheism - just & faithful God of the Covenant forming a people
Messiah - "Kingdom of God" to be formed within Covenant people: Israel over the Nations
Torah - (law) observance is faithfulness of pious Jew: *am ha'ares* observant?
Hasidim → Pharisees (Shammai ↔ Hillel) impossible for *am ha'ares*
Sadducees -
zealots - observance demands 'holiness' *what*
- NB Problem of Jewish Community: are they Essenes? what influence on Jews?

2. The Jewish Diaspora:

- a. Political: closely related to "Holy Land" Community, quasi-independent in Empire, separate from civic life of Empire: Coenon Alexandria (2/5 of population), Antioch, Rome. Mainly apostate in Mesopotamia outside Roman Empire. Completely urban in Roman Empire outside "Holy Land".
 - b. Economic: middle class, garment industry, small money lenders, spoke Koine Greek, had lost knowledge of Hebrew.
 - c. Religious: paid temple tax to Jerusalem, diaspora families "bought" Jerusalem high priesthood from time to time 20 BC to 40 A.D. Alexandria community translates OT into Septuagint, Philo & his philosophy & interpretation of Scripture (allegory), development of synagogue system (archisynagogos = prayer leader; archon & council of elders = internal civil affairs) Active in making converts (spreading Judaism) and development of sophisticated literary forms for their work of religious propaganda (eg Letter of Aristeas, Oracula Sybillina, Josephus' Contra Apionem). Development of 2 types of converts
① the fully converted (circumcised and observance of Jewish law)
② "God-fearers" (not circumcised, not observant all law, follow Sabbath & religious prayers)
- NB of ὁμογενεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ cf. Acts 16¹⁴; 17¹⁴; 18¹⁴ (Timothy, Lydia, Phrygians)

NB Christianity's Hebrew origins show in: Monotheism, Commandments of Moses, Septuagint, the network of diaspora Jewish Communities, literary forms, conversion techniques & Christ, initial forms of Christian community organization, development of Christian ministry, liturgy, and the large number of converts to Christianity from the οἱ ὁμογενεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ

Assignment: Read the Acts of the Apostles in the NT.

I

B. The Hellenistic Background:

1. Economic (agrarian based on "wheat, grape, olive")

- a) agriculture: small farmers \leftrightarrow latifundia (estates)
- b) mining - precious metals - gold & silver / copper
- c) slavery: most benign institution - not child industries 80% pop slaves
- d) industry
 - i) cloth (weaving) mono poly Jewish Diaspora
 - ii) shipbuilding - macedon -
 - iii) packaging (pottery) - Petrie - changed every 10 yrs. thing clay pots or shard(s)
 - iv) glass - not that will be forgotten - semi-precious art re-established for window glass 15th cen.

2. Social + Artistic:

- a) common language is Greek - Koine
- b) social classes:
 - i) slave
 - ii) non-slave
 - iii) Roman citizen 1/10 or 1/10 of pop. equivalent of Lord in Eng.
 women were non persons - not citizens but husbands gained by marriage to them
- c) population distribution:
 - i) urbani (city dwellers) \leftrightarrow pagani (country folk)
 - ii) 2/3 of population in Eastern part of Empire: East much richer than West
- d) status of women Gk., Turkey, Egypt. non persons - no legal rights - X-inity will change this.
- e) art forms derivative from Greek achievement of 400 BC \rightarrow 300 BC Diocletian
excellent in engineers - very practical

3. Political: Roman domination

- a) governmental form - military dictatorship with trappings of Roman Republic's oligarchical senatorial rule - dictator becomes "Emperor"
weakness: no constitutional process for succession to post of "Emperor" fights
- b) local governmental form depended on relationship to Rome (the Roman Empire was, in fact, a complex federation of "free cities", conquered kingdoms, and lands in the outright possession of the "Emperor". Egypt - private property - Emperor)
- c) major political consideration was "defense of Mediterranean shore lands" against 3 sets of pressures:
 - i) Persia in the East - Parthians
 - ii) "Numidia" in the Southwest: Rifles - Algerian - not blacks used opening controls
 - iii) Germanic tribes on the Northern frontiers: no such things as pure Arian race - were all mixed up -

4. Intellectual + Religious: Toleration + Judaism as a "religio licita"

Basically, they were empiricist - if you don't cause trouble behind anything you want - as long as you pay your taxes - upper echelon not made up of Platonists -

I.B.

4. Intellectual + Religious: Toleration + Judaism as a "religio licita":

a. Philosophies of the upper classes:

- i) Epicureanism: founder Epicurus (342-270 B.C.), born at Samos, active at Athens c. 306 BC, author of 300 treatises, Περὶ Φύσεως preserved in fragments which date from 58 BC. E's biographer is Diogenes Laërtius. disciples of E. were Hermarchus, Polystatus, Polyaenus, Metrodorus of Lampascus, Phaedrus (who was scholar of the Epicurean school which he founded with garden + house), P. traveled widely, Cicero heard him at Rome circa 90 BC. Most famous disciple was Lucretius who wrote De Rerum Natura. E. died in 51 BC.

doctrine:

Knowledge: fundamental criterion of truth is Perception (ἡ αἰσθησις) in which we attain what is clear (ἡ ἐνάρχησις). Perception takes place when images (εἰδωλα) penetrate the sense organs. Perception is always true; Error is only in the judgment (πρόληψις)

two other criteria for truth are:

- ① concepts (πρόληψις): these are εἰδωλα held in the memory. These 'memory images' are what we 'conceive' when we say "man", i.e., we call up an "image of" "man". If we refer this concept to the future, the statement is true only if it is confirmed by experience
- ② feeling (παθή): the criterion for conduct: the feeling of pleasure is what we should choose, not the feeling of pain. e.g. "Pleasure is the beginning + end of happy living". But, what is pleasure? Pleasure is the absence of pain.

It is ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀταραξία = serenity of soul

NB some pain may be endured if serenity follows. What E. is saying is that permanence of peace that follows an act is the fundamental criterion of what to do. there is no objective moral standard as serenity is different for each individual

"Physics":

The gods are made of atoms like men. They exemplify the ideal of serenity. The εἰδωλα which we have of gods requires that gods exist. However, gods did not cause the universe. Gods do not direct the universe because evil exists and evil is not compatible with any divine guidance. Men may honor gods in ceremonial worship but fear of them is foolish as well as seeking their favor through sacrifice.

I.
B. 4. a.

ii) Stoicism: founder, Zeno of Citium, born on Cyprus 335 B.C., died at Athens 263 B.C.. Circa 300 BC began to teach at Athens at the Στόα Ποικίλη (hence name of movement); death most probably due to suicide. Zeno was succeeded by Cleanthes who was in turn succeeded by Chrysippus who is reputed to be the second founder of the school. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tilde{\eta}\ \chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma, \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \tilde{\eta}\nu\ \Sigma\tau\omicron\alpha$ (If there were no Chrysippus, there would be no Stoia = If Chrysippus had not lived, Stoicism would have died.) Chrysippus wrote more than 705 books. In addition to Athens, Tarus was a center of Stoic thought.

doctrine:

Knowledge: Only the individual exists and our knowledge is knowledge of particular objects gained through sense impressions (τύψεις for Zeno, ἑτεροίωσις for Chrysippus). The soul is a tabula rasa (a blank blackboard). The sense impression stays in memory (μνήμη) when the object is no longer present. Experience arises from a grouping of similar recollections. Experience = ἐμπειρία (from which the English word empirical derives). Λόγος νοῦς (reason) rises out of experience. yet λόγος has a natural disposition to form and relate impressions deliberately (κοιτᾷ ἐννοιαὶ οὐ πρὸ λήψεως) or even antecedent to experience (ἐμφυτοὶ πρὸ λήψεως). Only through λόγος can the "whole scheme of reality" be known. Criterion of truth is φαντασία καταληπτική (representation of impression).

"Physics": Only matter exists. Matter is composed of 2 elements; τὸ πασχοῖ = the passive element; τὸ ποιῶν = the active element, like fire (πῦρ) + God and Consciousness. Analysing this 'active element', the Stoics maintained that πῦρ τεχνικόν (active fire) was the basic material that made up all real things. God was this basic material, in God it is perfectly conscious. God's consciousness is ὁ λόγος, the conscious principle from which all reality proceeds. All reality returns to the ὁ λόγος, by successive bleaching through of consciousness until an ἐκπύρωσις (universal conflagration) in which all reality is back in God and the whole individual process of going out from God & returning to God commences again. (Cyclic Eternal Recurrence)

Ethics:

Human beings are caught up in this cycle. Fate (Εἰρημένη) + Providence (Πρόνοια) are identical with one another & with God. Man is free only insofar as he alters his previous judgment on events that will endlessly recur. Man may at last see them as "God's will." Man achieves εὐδαιμονία (happiness) when he lives "according to nature". Man knows how to live "according to nature" when he has φρόνησις (moral insight → resignation → self-mastery). The man who has φρόνησις, acts with οἰκείωσις (being 'at home' in the world) and treats all men with equal cool regard.

I

B. 4. b.

Mystery Religions: popular religious cults based on a mythological explanation of the cycle of the seasons in which one is "initiated" by stages (usually 3 steps over a 3 year period, 1 step or stage in each year) into the mystery or secret of fertility, life & death. Cf. John Ferguson, The Religions of the Roman Empire. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1970, 1-2%. Frederick C. Grant, Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism. Liberal Arts Press, N.Y., 1953, xxxix-196 contains texts translated from Greek & Latin of the Hellenistic period concerning these religions. Cf. Ibid. esp. p. 62 & p. 195

Origin: Agrarian fertility cults

Creto-Mycenaean Cultures

Demeter + Kore
(Eleusis)

- wheat & seasons
- dark to bright
- grain drink

Dionysus
Orphism

Asia Minor

Artemis
(Ephesus)

symbol of fertility
feminine
woman

Anaëta
Mithraism

Syria

Asmode
Adonis

Egypt

Isis
Serapis
Osiris

life expectancy was 21 yrs.
no rehearsal disease in childhood

Common Elements:

- ① A myth concerning a common pair of deities dissimilar in rank, one male & one female. *male always stronger*
- ② secrecy — often the final initiation rite was sexual activity. *passion*
- ③ initiation by stages (eg *μύσος* = initial rite; *τέλετη* = dedication; *ἐπιτετυχη* = full revelation of the mystery) *confirmation* *euchrist!*
- ④ often priestesses for sacred prostitution, priests are emasculated — *eunuch*
- ⑤ emphasis on water cleansing, fasting, singing of Choral Hymns
- ⑥ part of the *ἐπιτετυχη* was an elaborate dance mime
- ⑦ use of symbolic clothing (linen tunics, elaborate capes etc.)

Mithraism: basic myth concerns Mithra, a young warrior-god, who was born from a rock and kills the celestial bull of fertility thereby becoming filled with virility & courage. Mithra battles the sun & wins his friendship and is taken up in a chariot to live with the sun forever. *going within in his journey around the sun - immortality*

Ritual 7 stages (Raven, Nymph, Soldier, Lion, Persian, Sun-bearer, Father) to which one is admitted by tests of courage. Initiation was by water (baptism). Cleansing, worship was a meal of bread & water shared by 24 members at most. Some of the tests of courage were extremely difficult. eg. branding (cauterization) to which Tertullian compares Confirmation. Mithraism was Christianity's greatest religious rival in Greco-Roman Times.

IV. Who was Jesus?

1. What does the question 'Who was Jesus?' mean?

a) historical answer *

- i) the historic individual
- ii) the historic evidence of belief about him

b) religious answer (3 levels)

- i) personal faith
- ii) community's faith-formulae in 'Creeds'
- iii) theological elaboration

2. Problems re materials concerning Jesus:

a) Criteria for sources

- i) secular
- ii) apocryphal
- iii) Canonical (This will be the second theme that we will study)

b) origin of the New Testament writings (Cf. separate sheet)

- i) Oral tradition → stroma → redaction (editing)
- ii) kerygma in Acts, Lyons in Philip, Passion Narrative, Pauline letters, "2" → Synoptics
- iii) interdependence of sources, discrepancies
- iv) Gospel as a literary form (not 19th century, 'scientific' biography)

N.B. Gospel fulfils the tests of Chronology (sequence) + topology (Cause + effect, i.e., human interaction in a given situation) sufficiently to be judged a valuable historical source of its period, time + culture. Gospel is written from viewpoint of faith (cf. 1b above) to elicit a response of faith in the reader (or hearer).

3. Broad Outline concerning Jesus:

- a) the witness of the Baptist
- b) public ministry in Galilee
- c) journey to Jerusalem
- d) death and 'resurrection' at Jerusalem (circa 29 A.D.) on a Friday (Passover) + 'rose on the third day' - it took place -- wd it mean, theological question

4. Problem of the teaching of Jesus:

- a) communicated orally (Jesus left no personal writings); his 'sayings' were grouped by 'word memory' or other techniques (presumably so grouped in "2")
- b) 'Sitz-im-leben' of original use of saying, and consequent official 'use of the saying' by the community

100.

Works of the New Testament (Est.) Approximate Dates of Composition

<u>Early 50's</u>	<u>Late 50's</u>	<u>Early 60's</u>	<u>Mid-60's</u>	<u>70's - 80's</u>	<u>90's</u>	<u>100-125</u>
1 Thessalonians 2 Thessalonians	Galatians 1 Corinthians 2 Corinthians Romans Philippians?	Philemon Colossians Ephesians? Philippians?	MARK 1 Timothy † Titus † 2 Timothy † 1 Peter? James? Hebrews?	MATTHEW LUKE Acts Jude? James? Hebrews?	JOHN Apocalypse 1 John 2 John 3 John Jude? 1 Clement*	2 Peter Ignatius Epistles* Didache*

Legenda: ? = date uncertain; † = if not written by Paul, date in 80's; * = Noncanonical

Pauline Corpus
 Early Letters: 1 Thess 51
 2 Thess 51
 Great Letters: Galatians 54-57
 1 Cor 57
 2 Cor 57
 Romans 58
 Philippians { 56-57
 or
 61-63
 Captivity Letters: Philemon 61-63
 Colossians 61-63
 Ephesians 61-63 †
 Pastoral Letters: 1 Timothy 65 †
 Titus 65 †
 2 Timothy 66-67 †

Gospels
 MARK 65
 MATTHEW 70's-80's
 LUKE 70's-80's
 JOHN 90's

Catholic Epistles
 1 Peter 64?
 James 62 or 80's
 Jude 70's-90's
 1 John 90's
 2 John 90's
 3 John 90's
 2 Peter 100-125

Other Writings
 Acts 70's-80's
 Hebrews 60's-80's
 Apocalypse 90's

H. J. Ryan, M.

in modern Jewish faith. While acknowledging that it is impossible to be certain whether the establishment of Israel marks the beginning of the Messianic era, Rabbi Wurzbarger refused to rule out the possibility that this might, in fact, be the case. "Granted that for a variety of reasons the State of Israel falls short of Messianic expectations," he argued, "there is no reason why even a purely Jewish State cannot serve as a preliminary phase in the unfolding of the Divine redemption." He then asked:

Does not the partial return of our people to the Land of Israel strengthen our faith in the feasibility of the ultimate ingathering of all the exiles? Moreover, can we imagine what the spiritual plight of our people would have been after the Holocaust, had the State of Israel not come into being? . . . It was because of the invigorating hope, strength, and vitality which the State of Israel has instilled within Jews everywhere, that we were able to witness such unprecedented resurgence of commitment to Jewish survival. Indeed, the breathtaking developments in the Land of Israel have confirmed our belief that the Jewish people will endure, return to Zion and eventually become the vehicle for the Redemption of mankind.

Jews would do well to heed the advice of Reinhold Niebuhr, a Zionist supporter, who wrote in 1944 that "no society . . . is great enough or good enough to make itself the final end of human existence."³⁷ Christians, for their part, must make a greater effort to see Israel within the context of the tragic history of twentieth-century Jewry. Christians in particular should remember the warning of Dante that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales, as well as the words of Henri Amiel that "Moral indifference is the malady of the cultivated classes."³⁸

Study and Discussion Questions

1. Would you agree with the author that "the greatest challenge confronting contemporary Christian-Jewish relations in the U. S. concerns the state of Israel"? If not, what is the greatest challenge? Discuss.
2. Discuss whether the author is correct in holding that Israel has become the religion of perhaps a majority of American Jews.
3. In what ways do American Jews equate the national interests of Israel and the U. S.? Do you find the arguments persuasive?
4. What is the thesis of I. L. Horowitz's book, *Israeli Ecstasies/Jewish Agonies*? What significance does Shapiro find in the Horowitz thesis?
5. According to the author, what changes have been introduced into classical Zionism by American Jews and why? Discuss.
6. Discuss in what ways, according to the author, American Jewish support of Israel has been manifested.

³⁷Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), p. 133.

³⁸*Journal Intime*, October 26, 1870; quoted in *The Macmillan Book of Proverbs, Maxims, and Famous Phrases*, selected and edited by Burton Stevenson (New York: Macmillan Co., 1948).

JESUS, THE PROPHETIC PHARISEE

William E. Phipps

PRECIS

Although scholars have acknowledged that Jesus was a Jew, there has been no real consensus with which group within the Judaism of his time he had the most affinities. The author argues that the Jesus of the synoptic gospels was a Pharisaic Jew.

The two distinguishing doctrines of the Pharisees—a view of divine providence consistent with human freedom, and human survival after death—were championed by Jesus. In addition, his non-violence, his simple but not extreme lifestyle, and his opposition to sham righteousness similarly resemble Pharisaic attitudes.

Jesus differed from the Pharisees in his more tolerant attitude toward outsiders, notably in his openness toward women, non-Jews, and the non-observant and uneducated. In his prophetic stance Jesus particularly departed from the Pharisaic tradition. Jesus is portrayed by the gospels as teaching with an unaccustomed authority and as denouncing ceremonial religion and picaresque casuistry. At the same time the Gospels tend to emphasize the differences between Jesus and the Pharisees, not the similarities, a theme that became in later Christian history a caricature of the Pharisees. Even in his criticisms of the Pharisees Jesus sought to purify the group of which he was a part.

To acknowledge with Julius Wellhausen that "Jesus was not a Christian"¹ has been difficult for the Western world. Although scholars do respect chronological sequence and affirm that Jesus was a Jew, they have never reached a consensus as to the group with whom he had the most affinities within the Judaism of his day and country.

Hermann Reimarus, an early German New Testament critic, suggested that Jesus belonged to or was a sympathizer of the Zealots.² That hypothesis has been painstakingly defended by a few Jewish and Christian scholars in our own time,³ but it has been rather thoroughly discounted.⁴ Likewise there have been scholars who have claimed that Jesus was an

¹J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien* (Berlin, 1905), p. 113.

²C. H. Talbert, ed., *Reimarus: Fragments* (Philadelphia, 1970), pp. 144-153.

³E.g., Joel Carmichael, *The Death of Jesus* (London, 1966); S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (New York, 1967).

⁴Cf. Oscar Cullmann, *Jesus and the Revolutionaries* (New York, 1970); Alan Richardson, *The Political Christ* (Philadelphia, 1973).

William Eugene Phipps (Presbyterian Church, U.S.) received his B.S. from Davidson (NC) College; his M. Div. from Union Theological Seminary, Richmond; and his Ph.D. from St. Andrews University in Scotland (1954). He has taught at Davis and Elkins College since 1956, presently chairing the Department of Religion and Philosophy. He taught previously at Peace College, Raleigh, NC, and has been a visiting professor at Nassau College, SUNY. His books include *Was Jesus Married? The Distortion of Sexuality in the Christian Tradition* (Harper & Row, 1970); *The Sexuality of Jesus: Theological and Literary Perspectives* (Harper & Row, 1973); and *Recovering Biblical Sensuousness* (Westminster, 1975). He is also the author of numerous book reviews and articles in books and journals.

Essene,⁵ but the implausibility of this has been demonstrated.⁶ There has been at least one defense of Jesus as a Sadducee, but this position has not been taken very seriously.⁷ Travers Herford portrayed Jesus as an *am-ha-aretz* (that is, an unlearned peasant) "outside the Pharisaic circle."⁸ Geza Vermes has recently argued that "Jesus did not belong among the Pharisees, Essenes, Zealots or Gnostics, but was one of the holy miracle-workers of Galilee."⁹

Some eminent Jewish scholars have concluded that Jesus was a Pharisee. Over a century ago Abraham Geiger called Jesus a Galilean Pharisee.¹⁰ A generation ago Joseph Klausner attempted to prove that "Jesus remained a Pharisaic Jew."¹¹ Martin Buber, who accepted the form critical approach to interpreting the Gospels, agreed with Klausner on this central point. With regard to Pharisaic Judaism Buber stated: "Jesus, in so far as we are able to unravel his historical reality, occupied a position within this circle of belief."¹²

Most Christians, assuming that "Pharisee" is synonymous with "hypocrite," abhor associating Jesus with a sin that their sinless leader frequently exposed. Even so, a few Christian scholars in recent years have suggested that Jesus was a part of the Pharisaic movement.¹³ However, no one has given much attention to detailing the many particular points of comparison between Jesus and the Pharisees.

I agree with those who insist that Jesus' message and mission cannot be properly comprehended without seeing him as a Pharisaic Jew. In this essay I shall present evidence that is germane to showing the relationship between the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels and the Pharisaic party of the century in which he lived. Assuming that Pharisaic piety is for the most part faithfully transmitted in the Talmud, my comparisons will occasionally be supplemented by tradition which, in written form, is no earlier than medieval Judaism.

The Pharisaic Party

Jesus lived at the mid-point of the three centuries in which the Pharisaic party flourished. Its stronghold was at first in Judea, but in its later years it

⁵E.g., Heinrich Graetz, *Sinai et Golgotha, ou les origines du judaisme et du christianisme* (Paris, 1867), p. 308; U. C. Ewing, *The Essene Christ* (New York, 1961).

⁶Cf. Jean Carmignac, *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Baltimore, 1962).

⁷Rudolf Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer* (Berlin, 1912), pp. 228, 291. This position is criticized by H. Revel in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 7 (New Series), 429-438.

⁸R. T. Herford, *The Pharisees* (Boston, 1962), p. 206.

⁹G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London, 1973), p. 223.

¹⁰A. Geiger, *Das Judentum und seine Geschichte* (1864), p. 117.

¹¹J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York, 1925), p. 319.

¹²M. Buber, *Two Types of Faith* (New York, 1961), p. 137; cp. pp. 79, 92, 159, 160.

¹³E.g., James Parkes, *Judaism and Christianity* (Chicago, 1948), p. 41; John Pawlikowski, "Jesus and the Revolutionaries," *The Christian Century* (Dec. 6, 1972), p. 1240; Andrew Greeley, *New York Times Magazine* (Dec. 23, 1973), p. 28.

was centered in Galilee. It emerged from the Hasidim ("Pious") who supported the Maccabean revolt against the Hellenistic paganism which was infiltrating Palestine. The name "Pharisee" was probably derived from *perushim* ("separate") to refer to those who struggled to set themselves apart from the defiling religious practices of the ruling powers. At the time when Jesus was born some 6,000 Pharisees risked their lives by refusing to pledge allegiance to Herod. Among them were some who destroyed the golden eagle which the king erected over the entrance to the new Jerusalem temple because they thought it was idolatrous. In retaliation for this Herod burned several Pharisees alive.¹⁴ The total number of Pharisees may well have been larger than 6,000, but even that many adult male Pharisees would suggest that at least 25,000 people belonged to Pharisaic families. That would have been a sizable proportion of the total Jewish population of Palestine.

Josephus points out that the Pharisees had the masses on their side,¹⁵ so the impact of the party went far beyond those who were recognized as members. Their popular appeal was due to several factors. They were admired for their quiet but determined refusal to compromise religious liberty in order to please the puppets of the alien Roman government. Also, the leaders of the Pharisees usually rose from the common people. In addition, it was the Pharisees who had developed the synagogue, bringing the community center to most Palestinian towns. The synagogue provided a place for education and worship and a forum for dispensing local justice.

The Pharisees should not be thought of as sectarian in the sense that they were separate from the main body of Judaism. Hillel, their most outstanding leader, advised, "Keep not aloof from the congregation."¹⁶ They participated with their compatriots at the temple and in the synagogue. Indeed, the Pharisees were so much a part of the mainstream of the Jewish community that, unlike the other Jewish parties, they continued after the Jewish state was destroyed and formed the nucleus of subsequent Judaism.

Similarities between Jesus and the Pharisees

Josephus presented two distinguishing doctrines of the Pharisaic party, both of which were championed by Jesus. First, the Pharisees advocated a view of divine providence that was consistent with human freedom. They rejected the extreme positions of the Essenes and the Sadducees. The former emphasized divine determinism whereas the latter stressed human choices.¹⁷ The Pharisees held this moderating position: "It has pleased

¹⁴Josephus, *Antiquities* 17, 2, 4; 17, 6, 2-3.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 13, 10, 6.

¹⁶*Aboth* 2, 5.

¹⁷Josephus, *Antiquities* 18, 1, 5; *Wars* 2, 8, 14.

God to make a temperament whereby what he wills is done, but so that human will can act virtuously or viciously."¹⁸

The Mishnah and the Psalms of Solomon contain views of Pharisees that are in harmony with Josephus' summary statement on their doctrine of providence. Rabbi Akiba succinctly stated: "All is foreseen but freedom of choice is given."¹⁹ The paradox is presented in the Psalms of Solomon in this way: "No human can add to, so as to enlarge, what has been prescribed by you, O God." But "our works are subject to our own choice, and power to do right or wrong is in our own hands."²⁰

In a similar manner Jesus assumed both the almightiness of God and the freedom to assert one's own will, without attempting to resolve the logical dilemma. Such theology can be illustrated by this prayer: "Father, you can do anything; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will but what you will."²¹

The Pharisees favored the God-as-king figure for picturing divine providence. Among the most frequently said benedictions in the ancient synagogue was this: "Reign thou over us, O Lord, thou alone, in loving kindness. . . . Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the King who lovest righteousness and judgment."²² Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai even remarked that "a prayer in which there is no mention of the kingdom is no prayer."²³ That rabbi used a parable to convey his theology. He told of a king who invited his subjects to a banquet without indicating the precise time when it would be given. The wise prepared for the party well in advance so that they would be ready whenever the palace gate opened. When the party began, the king was angered that some were caught by surprise and were improperly dressed. Those foolish ones were not permitted to join in the festivities.²⁴

The sovereignty of God was also at the core of Jesus' teaching. Finding the kingship of God in his favorite psalms and prophetic books, he proclaimed that "the reign of God is near."²⁵ Jesus also, in rabbinical fashion, used stories to describe the way in which joy and judgment would characterize the divinely initiated kingdom. Matthew joined together two such parables pertaining to a king who gave a marriage feast. That king became angered and filled the wedding hall with other guests when those who were first invited neglected to attend. One fellow who was not in proper attire was cast out.²⁶ Rabbi Jesus and Rabbi Johanan taught that God's servants

¹⁸Josephus, *Antiquities* 18, 1, 3.

¹⁹*Aboth* 3, 16.

²⁰*Psalms of Solomon* 5, 6; 9, 7.

²¹Mark 14:36.

²²*Shemoneh Esreh* 11.

²³*Berakoth* 12a; cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism* II (New York, 1971), p. 373.

²⁴*Shabbath* 153a.

²⁵Mark 1:15.

²⁶Mt. 22:1-14.

were expected to exercise their freedom so that they would ever be ready to celebrate God's coming.

The second doctrine of the Pharisees that Josephus mentioned pertains to the hereafter. The Pharisees, unlike the Sadducees, believed that human life survives death.²⁷ Again, the Mishnah and the Psalms of Solomon also refer to this belief. Rabbi Jacob said: "This world is like a vestibule before the world to come; prepare yourself in the vestibule that you may enter into the banqueting hall."²⁸ One of the Psalms of Solomon describes the resurrection thus: "The life of the righteous shall be forever; but the sinners shall be taken away to destruction."²⁹

In criticism of the Sadducees "who say there is no resurrection," Jesus asserted: "Men and women do not marry when they rise from the dead; they are like angels in heaven. And as for the dead being raised, have you not read . . . how God said to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'?"³⁰ The present tense of the verb in that quotation from Exodus was taken by Jesus to prove that the patriarchs, who were then physically dead, continue to be in a personal relationship with God.

The ideas and the method of argumentation in that response are thoroughly rabbinical. Jesus' interpretation of the Torah was similar to one given in the Talmud. From numbers 18:28, "You shall give the Lord's offering to Aaron the priest," Rabbi Johanan deduced that Aaron was still living in heaven and thus "here is the resurrection of the dead signified."³¹ And Jesus' belief in angels was also characteristic of the Pharisees.³²

With regard to punitive matters, Josephus indicates that the Pharisees had the reputation for advocating less severe punishments than their Sadducaic rivals.³³ Whereas the Sadducees rigidly interpreted the "eye for an eye" standard of Moses, the Pharisees preferred compensatory payment in lieu of exact retribution.³⁴ The sympathetic outlook of their prominent spokesperson Hillel is well expressed in this maxim: "Judge not your

²⁷Josephus, *Antiquities* 18, 1, 3-4; cf. Acts 23:8.

²⁸*Aboth* 4, 16.

²⁹*Psalms of Solomon* 13, 9-10.

³⁰Mark 12:18, 25-26. Form critics will doubtless question my accepting as authentic most of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. It is difficult to find any general agreement among such critics as to what sayings allegedly were originated in the Christian community after Jesus' crucifixion. Indeed, one of the most respected of form critics, Rudolf Bultmann, cites Mark 12:18-27 as evidence that Jesus expected the resurrection of the dead in *Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1951), p. 6, but states of the same passage in *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York, 1963), p. 26, that it "simply reflects the theological activity of the church." The manifest subjectivity here is not untypical of form criticism. Consequently I assume that the burden of proof lies with those who claim that the sayings attributed to Jesus in the Synoptics are creations after his death.

³¹*Sanhedrin* 90b.

³²Acts 23:8.

³³Josephus, *Antiquities* 13, 10, 6; 20, 9, 1.

³⁴Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 220-221.

neighbor until you have put yourself in his place."³⁵ It is significant that among the Jews it was not the Pharisees and their scribes, but the Sadducees and their priests, who were mainly involved in the cruel events in Jerusalem that resulted in Jesus' death. Gamaliel may have typified the Pharisees in counseling the Sanhedrin to avoid capital vengeance with respect to the followers of Jesus.³⁶

Hillel and his prominent disciple Johanan ben Zakkai expressed the Pharisees' restraint with respect to killing. The former was known as a lover of peace and of all humanity.³⁷ On seeing evidence of death by violence, he observed that such conduct stimulates more of the same.³⁸ According to the Talmud, Rabbi Johanan also renounced the use of the sword and thus opposed resisting Rome during the siege of Jerusalem.³⁹ Similarly, Jesus opposed the rebellion against Rome that was brewing and believed that his people could pay taxes to Caesar without compromising their service to God.⁴⁰

The sources of ancient Judaism also attest to the non-materialistic orientation of the Pharisees. Josephus contrasts their simple lifestyle with that of the Sadducaic plutocrats.⁴¹ Hillel's detachment from possessions can be discerned in his saying: "The more flesh, the more worms; the more property, the more anxiety."⁴² Due perhaps to the poverty conditions from which he arose, he "made the poor and the broken a loving concern of his private life and represented the cause of the poor."⁴³ The Pharisees urged their people to replace the common morality which holds "What is mine is mine and what is yours is yours," with this unselfish principle: "What is mine is yours and what is yours is your own."⁴⁴ Jesus also taught that true piety consisted in serving rather than in being served.⁴⁵ He charged his followers to live simply and to give to the poor.⁴⁶

The Pharisees did not assume that assisting those in need implied the renunciation of pleasures for oneself. They favored the way of self-affirmation which avoided both extreme altruism and extreme egoism. As Hillel put it in his query, "If I am not for myself, who is for me? And when I am for myself only, what am I?"⁴⁷ These questions reflect the command-

³⁵ *Aboth* 2, 5.

³⁶ Acts 5:33-39.

³⁷ *Aboth* 1, 12.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 2, 7.

³⁹ *Yoma* 39b; cf. Jacob Neusner, *First Century Judaism in Crisis* (Nashville, 1975), pp. 135-147.

⁴⁰ Mark 12:17; cf. Luke 19:41-44.

⁴¹ Josephus, *Antiquities* 18, 1, 3; 13, 10, 6.

⁴² *Aboth* 2, 7.

⁴³ N. N. Glatzer, *Hillel the Elder* (Washington, 1959), p. 44.

⁴⁴ *Aboth* 5, 10.

⁴⁵ Mark 10:45.

⁴⁶ Mark 6:8-9; 10:21.

⁴⁷ *Aboth* 1, 14.

ment "love your neighbor as yourself,"⁴⁸ which implies both self-love and concern for others. The Pharisees especially enjoyed eating and dancing, even though they occasionally devoted themselves to fasting. "Be sure to eat and drink," the Talmud advises, "for the world we leave is like a wedding feast."⁴⁹ The Pharisees, in contrast to the Sadducees, engaged in joyful dancing at the Tabernacle festival.⁵⁰

Jesus also compared his lifestyle to a wedding celebration. He was more interested in feasting than in fasting, although he thought that the optimum life was inseparable from self-denial.⁵¹ The moderate attitude toward pleasure by both Jesus and the Pharisees was in contrast to the asceticism that was then found in some Mediterranean cults.⁵² Rudolf Bultmann rightly notes that Jesus was "far removed" from the asceticism which assumes "that the material world, the body, the senses, are evil."⁵³

Indignation over sham righteousness is another point on which similarities between Jesus and the Pharisees can be discovered. "Let ravens peck out the eyes of the hypocrites," thundered an early Pharisee, "for they have laid waste many houses of men in dishonor and scattered them in their lust."⁵⁴ It was probably a Pharisee in Jesus' day who accused those whose "hands and minds are unclean but who say, 'Do not touch me lest you defile me!'"⁵⁵ Rabbi Joshua ben Hananiah included the "cunning knave" and "the plague of the Pharisees" among those things that were ruining the world.⁵⁶ In the Talmud the "knave" is identified as the scribe who applies the law to self in a way to lighten its requirements, but inflicts it in a more burdensome way on others.⁵⁷ Of the seven varieties of Pharisees that are described in the Talmud, only two are considered to be genuinely pious.⁵⁸

Jesus heaped scorn on Pharisees who appeared morally immaculate on the outside but were inwardly defiled.⁵⁹ Ironically Jesus showed his own Pharisaic spirit in those shrill judgments.⁶⁰ For that party was, as has been shown, quite sensitive to and disgusted by the insincerity of some of its members. In a similar way the apostle Peter exposed the hypocrisy of a Christian couple and the apostle Paul opposed the same sin in Peter.⁶¹ Such

⁴⁸ Lev. 19:18.

⁴⁹ *Erubin* 54a.

⁵⁰ *Sukkah* 4 and 5.

⁵¹ Mark 3:18-19; 8:34.

⁵² Cf. W. E. Phipps, *Was Jesus Married?* (New York, 1970), pp. 120-123.

⁵³ R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (New York, 1958), p. 101.

⁵⁴ *Psalms of Solomon* 4, 22.

⁵⁵ *Assumption of Moses* 8, 9-10; cf. L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees* (Philadelphia, 1966), p. 98.

⁵⁶ *Sotah* 3, 4.

⁵⁷ *Jerusalem Sotah* 19a.

⁵⁸ *Sotah* 22b; *Jerusalem Berakoth* 14b.

⁵⁹ Mt. 23:1-36.

⁶⁰ Cf. Buber, *Two Types*, pp. 61-62.

⁶¹ Acts 5:1-4; Gal. 2:11-13.

honest internal criticism reveals more about the health of a group than about its sickness.

Differences between Jesus and the Pharisees

The main difference between Jesus and the general outlook of the all-male Pharisaic party can be discerned in the way they treated outsiders—women, gentiles, and the *am-ha-aretz*. The haughtiness of the Pharisees is summed up in the prayer of Rabbi Judah: "Blessed be Thou for not having made me a gentile, a woman, or an ignoramus."⁶²

During the century when the Pharisaic party originated, a Jerusalem scribe ridiculed women in a way that was to become typical of the Pharisees. Jesus ben Sirach charged: "Woman is the origin of sin, and it is through her that we all die. Do not leave a leaky cistern to drip or allow a bad wife to say what she likes. If she does not accept her control, divorce her and send her away." Ben Sirach's antifeminism continues: "Out of clothes comes the moth, and out of woman comes wickedness. A man's wickedness is better than a woman's goodness; it is woman who brings shame and disgrace."⁶³ Hillel commented, "The more women, the more witchcrafts."⁶⁴ The school of Hillel, noting that the Mosaic law permitted a man to divorce his wife if "he finds something obnoxious about her," maintained that even the spoiling of a dish of food was sufficient grounds for a man to write his wife a bill of divorcement and oust her from his house.⁶⁵ Some other rabbis argued that divorce should be permitted if a wife scolds so loudly inside her house that the neighbors hear her voice, or if she goes out with her hair unbound.⁶⁶ Wives accused of infidelity, but not their sexual partners, were subjected to a terrifying ordeal.⁶⁷

Josephus, who belonged to the Pharisaic party, stated that "woman is in all things inferior to man."⁶⁸ Due to the imputation of lower status to women, families occasionally treated unwanted daughters in an undignified manner. A father could sell his female child into slavery.⁶⁹ A recurring theme in the Mishnah is that only males should be educated. One tractate says: "Let your house be a meeting-place for the sages, and sit amid the dust at their feet and thirstily drink in their words. . . . He that talks much with women brings evil upon himself and neglects the study of the Law and in the end will occupy a place in hell."⁷⁰ Teaching a daughter

⁶²Tosephta Berakoth 7, 18.

⁶³Sirach 25:24-26; 42:13-14.

⁶⁴Abot 2, 7.

⁶⁵Deut. 24:1 (New Jewish Translation); Gittin 9, 10.

⁶⁶Ketuboth 7, 6.

⁶⁷Sotah 1, 5-6; 3, 4; cf. W. E. Phipps, *The Sexuality of Jesus* (New York, 1973), pp. 56-57.

⁶⁸Josephus, *Life* 2; *Against Apion* 2, 24.

⁶⁹Mekilta Exodus 21, 7 and 20; cp. Ex. 21:7.

⁷⁰Abot 1, 4-5.

knowledge of the Law was reckoned to be as bad as teaching her lechery.⁷¹

There is no evidence that Jesus shared the Pharisaic view of female inferiority. He saw in the Garden of Eden story not that woman was the source of sin but that she was half of the marital whole.⁷² The story of Jesus and the adulterous woman displays his rejection of the double standard in sexual morality.⁷³ He was willing to teach women and he accepted them in his traveling band.⁷⁴

Jesus advocated life-long marriage of those whom "God has joined together" in contrast to the prevailing system in which only the husband had the right to divorce a displeasing spouse.⁷⁵ His sentiments were akin to those of the post-exilic prophet who pronounced in the name of the Lord, "I hate divorce!" to the faithless man who had broken his "covenant" with "the wife of his youth."⁷⁶

The Pharisees commonly separated themselves from non-Jews and believed that God would segregate gentiles from faithful Jews in the life after death. Intense hatred is expressed in the mishnaic injunction that "an Israelite may not aid a gentile woman in childbirth since she would be assisting to bring to birth a child for idolatry."⁷⁷ With similar fanaticism Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus proclaimed: "No gentile will have a part in the world to come."⁷⁸

Jesus was raised in an environment in which gentiles were not appreciated. Yet, if we assume, with Luke, that he grew religiously and socially, then it is likely that his development involved internalizing a prophetic outlook which advocated breaking away from ethnic exclusiveness in order to become "a light to the gentiles."⁷⁹ This, at least, is a reasonable interpretation of the episode regarding Jesus' confrontation with a Phoenician woman.⁸⁰ After an initial impulsive rejection of the gentile "dog," he came to realize that she was as worthy of his concern as his fellow Jews. In this experience Jesus enlarged his sense of mission even as Peter's later confrontation with Cornelius caused the apostle to break down some of his cultural prejudices.⁸¹ On another occasion Jesus was "astounded" by the concern of a Roman centurion and admitted that he had not found such faith among his own people.⁸² Also, the heroes of a parable and an episode in Luke are non-Jewish Samaritans.⁸³

⁷¹Sotah 3, 4.

⁷²Mark 10:7.

⁷³John 8:2-11.

⁷⁴Mark 15:40-41; Luke 8:1-3; 10:39; John 4:7-27.

⁷⁵Mark 10:2-12.

⁷⁶Mal. 2:13-16.

⁷⁷Abodah Zarah 2, 1.

⁷⁸Tosephta Sanhedrin 13, 2.

⁷⁹Luke 2:52; Isa. 49:6; cf. Acts 13:47.

⁸⁰Mark 7:24-30; cf. Sherman Johnson, *Jesus in His Homeland* (New York, 1957), p. 79.

⁸¹Acts 10.

⁸²Luke 7:1-10.

⁸³Luke 10:29-37; 17:11-19.

In addition to fraternizing with gentiles and with women, Jesus was also different from the Pharisees in his relationship with those Jewish men who did not follow the oral traditions scrupulously. He would not have accepted the rule that "a Pharisee may not eat with an *am-ha-aretz*."⁸⁴ His attitude stood in bold relief to that of Rabbi Yannai who invited a stranger to dine in his home. The guest, when requested to return thanks, confessed that he did not know any prayers. The rabbi then told him to repeat after him: "A dog has eaten the bread of Yannai."⁸⁵ Jesus lampooned the type of person who prayed like this:

I thank you, O Lord, my God, that you have set my lot with those who sit in the house of learning, and not with those who sit at the streetcorners. I and they rise early—I to the words of the Torah, but they to things of no account. I and they labor, but I labor and receive a reward while they labor and receive no reward. I and they run—I to the life of the world to come, but they to the pit of destruction.⁸⁶

Jesus the Prophet

The fact that Jesus had some significant disagreements with the general position of the Pharisees can best be understood by investigating his prophetic outlook. From the beginning to the end of his public ministry Jesus thought of himself as a prophet. The vision and voice that he received at his baptism was similar to the "call" experienced by some Israelite prophets.⁸⁷ According to Luke, Jesus adopted Isaiah's manifesto as his own, referred to himself as a prophet, and defended his acceptance of gentiles by demonstrating that his outlook was like that of Elijah and Elisha.⁸⁸ Toward the end of his ministry he announced, "It cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem."⁸⁹ Whereas Jesus seemed quite reluctant to declare himself to be the Messiah, he showed no such reluctance to calling himself a prophet.

Jesus' self-consciousness of having a prophet's role corresponded with his public image. Some Galileans described Jesus as "a prophet like one of the old prophets" and exclaimed, "A great prophet has arisen among us!"⁹⁰ The Passover pilgrims at Jerusalem hailed Jesus as a prophet, and one of his disciples there referred to him as "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people."⁹¹ In John's Gospel, as well as in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is frequently called a prophet.⁹²

⁸⁴*Tosephta Shabbath* 1, 15; cf. *Berakoth* 43b; Luke 5:29-30; 15:2.

⁸⁵*Leviticus Rabbah* 9, 3.

⁸⁶*Berakoth* 28b; Luke 18:11-12.

⁸⁷Cp. Mark 1:10-11 with 1 Kings 22:19-22; Isa. 6; Ezek. 1-2.

⁸⁸Luke 4:16-27.

⁸⁹Luke 13:33.

⁹⁰Mark 6:15; Luke 7:16.

⁹¹Mt. 21:11, 46; Luke 24:19.

⁹²John 4:19; 6:14; 7:40; 9:17.

The biblical test for the true prophet is whether or not his or her prophecy comes to pass in accord with God's purposes.⁹³ Hence, the Gospel writers thought that the genuineness of Jesus was enhanced by the fulfillment of his predictions. They held that he forecasted with accuracy the treachery of Judas, the failure of Peter, his own rejection by religious leaders, and the destruction of Jerusalem.⁹⁴

That Jesus should be recognized as a prophet is quite significant, for most of his Jewish contemporaries assumed that the era of prophetic revelation had ended.⁹⁵ Montefiore points out that rabbis of Jesus' day "were not called prophets, and they could not properly have been called so. . . . Hillel was ever the servant of the Law, never its judge."⁹⁶ The cessation of prophecy is affirmed in one of the last of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, but hope is also expressed in those books for its revival.⁹⁷ This expectation continued in extra-biblical Jewish writings of the centuries immediately preceding the coming of Jesus.⁹⁸ Attention was focused on what God said through Moses to the people: "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren; I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him."⁹⁹ Jesus is presumed to be the fulfillment of that scripture at several places in the New Testament.¹⁰⁰

It was due to the revival of prophetic revelation in Jesus that his contemporaries observed that he taught "as one that had authority and not as the scribes."¹⁰¹ As we have seen, Jesus was gifted at quoting scripture and interpreting it in a scribal manner, but he was also aware of being a direct spokesperson for God. Consequently, he was bold to state views that were independent of, and even contradictory to, written authority. We know of no other Pharisee who had the audacity to counter Moses' basic "eye for an eye" maxim with the principle that loving concern toward adversaries should completely replace any type of retribution. Jesus, in the spirit of Hosea, rejected the Mosaic law that did not permit marital reconciliation after a husband had rashly divorced his wife.¹⁰² "But I say to you," a repeated phrase in the Sermon on the Mount, displays that Jesus occasionally substituted personal authority for biblical authority. The former is firsthand, whereas the latter is indirect, derived from the witnesses of earlier times.

⁹³Deut. 13:1-5; 18:21-22; Jer. 28.

⁹⁴Mark 8:31, 13:1-2, 14:17-21, 30.

⁹⁵1 *Maccabees* 9:27; cf. Moore, *Judaism* I, pp. 421-422.

⁹⁶C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (New York, 1968), p. cxx.

⁹⁷Zech. 13:2-6; Mal. 4:5; Joel 2:28-29.

⁹⁸1 *Maccabees* 14:41; *Sirach* 48:10; *Manual of Discipline* (Qumran) 9:11.

⁹⁹Deut. 18:18.

¹⁰⁰Acts 3:22-23; 7:37; John 1:21, 25, 6:14, 7:40, 12:49.

¹⁰¹Mark 1:22.

¹⁰²Mt. 5:31-48.

Jesus renewed the prophetic polemic against ceremonial religion, believing that the Pharisees had, in general, been too lax in fulfilling the stringent moral dimension of prophetic Judaism. Micah had epitomized the prophetic message in asserting that it was unacceptable to substitute sacrificial offerings for just actions, steadfast love, and humility before God.¹⁰³ But many of the Pharisees allowed petty rituals to take priority over ethical obligations. They warned, for example, that "he who fails to take seriously the handwashing ceremony will perish from the earth."¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, "whoever has phylacteries on his body, the fringe of his garment, and the mezuzah on his door may be presumed to be safe from committing sin."¹⁰⁵

It seems that many Pharisees were so busy adding detailed applications to the Mosaic code that its broad principles were being overlooked. Josephus states: "The Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the law of Moses."¹⁰⁶ The Mishnah likewise indicates that one of their main aims was "to make a fence around the Law."¹⁰⁷ The devout were not only to carry out the 613 commandments of the Pentateuch but also were to observe the voluminous more recent specific formulations of those laws. Casuistry regarding the Sabbath is the best illustration of this tendency. The Mosaic injunction to rest on the Sabbath was considered too vague. Hence the Mishnah lists thirty-nine types of prohibited work, including tying and loosening a knot. Arguments are then considered on how precisely to define a knot.¹⁰⁸

The Gospels indicate that Jesus was indebted to the oral interpretations of the Pharisees. Luke reports that Jesus "went to the synagogue, as his custom was, on the sabbath day."¹⁰⁹ It was "the tradition of the elders," not the law of Moses, that gave sanction to such conduct.¹¹⁰ Yet he exercised independent judgment on which traditions to uphold. He approved of saying a blessing before meals, as the Mishnah prescribes,¹¹¹ but rejected the handwashing ritual.¹¹² Also, Jesus discarded the picayune regulations which prohibited people from plucking enough grain on the Sabbath to satisfy their hunger.¹¹³ He argued that human need should take priority over cultic custom by citing the example of David. After fleeing to

Nob a priest gave David consecrated bread to eat, even though it was unusual for a common man to receive such.¹¹⁴ In contrast to the prevailing heavy "yoke of the law,"¹¹⁵ Jesus announced, "My yoke is easy and my burden is light."¹¹⁶

To explain why Jesus violated some Pharisaic traditions, Matthew twice places on Jesus' lips the words of Hosea.¹¹⁷ "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice" is a summarizing oracle of that prophet. Jesus, like Hosea, had little interest in temple sacrifice. Both criticized the corrupt priesthood and focused on the ethical obligation of love. Jesus stated his priority in this way: "Be reconciled to your brother before leaving your gift at the altar."¹¹⁸

Conclusion

It is, in a way, unfortunate that the oral tradition about Jesus was becoming fixed in Palestine at a time when Christianity was being persecuted by Judaism. The Acts of the Apostles is filled with accounts of synagogue and Sanhedrin attacks on the infant church. Consequently, the compilers of the Gospels were disposed to emphasize the ways in which Jesus differed from the Pharisees and to omit or play down those episodes in which Jesus and the Pharisees were in substantial agreement. Given this start, plus the continued bitterness between the church and the synagogue throughout the Christian era, it is no wonder that there has been little acknowledgment in the two communities of any strong positive bonds between Jesus and the Pharisees.

The caricature of the Pharisees by Christians is as absurd as that of Jesus in the Talmud. There he is alluded to as a bastard and a sorcerer.¹¹⁹ In a parallel manner Matthew Black, a distinguished New Testament scholar, writing in a highly influential work, describes Pharisaism as "a sterile religion of codified tradition."¹²⁰ A religious tradition that sired medieval and modern Judaism can hardly be called impotent! Yet Black's contemporary denigration of the Pharisees is relatively mild compared with the diatribes of past Christian scholarship. Alfred Edersheim, for instance, wrote a widely used tome which attempts to show "the infinite distance between Christ and the teaching of the synagogue."¹²¹

¹⁰³ Micah 6:6-8.

¹⁰⁴ *Sotah* 4b; *Eduyoth* 5, 6.

¹⁰⁵ *Menahoth* 43b.

¹⁰⁶ Josephus, *Antiquities* 13, 10, 6.

¹⁰⁷ *Aboth* 1, 1.

¹⁰⁸ *Shabbath* 7, 2; 15, 1-2.

¹⁰⁹ Luke 4:16.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Josephus, *Against Apion* 2, 7.

¹¹¹ Mark 7:41, 14:22; *Berakoth* 3, 3-4.

¹¹² Mark 7:1-5.

¹¹³ Mark 2:23-27.

¹¹⁴ 1 Sam. 21:1-6.

¹¹⁵ *Aboth* 3, 5; *Berakoth* 2, 2.

¹¹⁶ Mt. 11:30.

¹¹⁷ Mt. 9:13, 12:7; Hosea 6:6.

¹¹⁸ Mt. 5:24.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 22-31.

¹²⁰ "The Pharisees," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1962).

¹²¹ A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II (New York, 1900), p. 15. This book was reissued by Eerdmans Publishing Co. in 1972.

In spite of the acrimonious historical controversy between Jews and Christians, it is possible to detect in the Gospels that Jesus would have agreed with this succinct description of the Pharisees written by Josephus: "The Pharisees are a group of Jews who have the reputation of excelling the rest of their nation in the observance of religion."¹²² Regarding the Pharisees, Jesus told his disciples to "Practice and observe whatever they tell you."¹²³ He endorsed the Pharisaic belief that the Shema and the neighbor-love commandments were of central importance in the Torah.¹²⁴

Christians are quick to point out that Jesus frequently indulged in conscious exaggeration, such as when he commanded his followers to pluck out their eyes if that should reduce the stimulus to sin.¹²⁵ But they are slower to recognize ludicrous hyperbole when he tells of the synagogue-goer who tooted a trumpet before contributing to charity.¹²⁶ Surely Jesus did not think the *typical* Pharisee was unaware of his sins and prayed: "God, I think you that I am not like other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even like this tax collector. I fast twice a week, I give tithes of all that I get."¹²⁷ Actually the dominant group of Pharisees condemned haughty pride and endorsed the same moral that is given at the conclusion of Jesus' parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector.¹²⁸ The Talmud states: "The school of Hillel teaches you that he who humbles himself the Lord raises up, and he who exalts himself the Lord humbles; greatness flees him who seeks greatness; greatness may follow him who flees from greatness."¹²⁹

It has been demonstrated in this paper that Jesus had both basic agreements and disagreements with some general Pharisaic beliefs and attitudes. This can best be interpreted to mean that he was a Pharisee who engaged in intense interaction with other Pharisees. That party tolerated considerable diversity within its ranks, for the opposition between Hillelites and Shammites was quite wide on some issues. Jesus agreed with Shammai in rejecting easy divorce and with Hillel in rejecting harsh punishment. Yet, on other issues, he championed fresh viewpoints independent from either.

Jesus was like the resourceful scribe whom he commended as being able to "bring out of his treasure what is new and what is old."¹³⁰ On the one hand he rejected the view that "the older, the better" is as true for religion as for wine.¹³¹ On the other hand he defended but few novel ideas

¹²²Josephus, *Wars* 1, 5, 2.

¹²³Mt. 23:3.

¹²⁴Mt. 22:34-40; Mark 12:28-34; Luke 10:25-28; cf. I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (New York, 1967), pp. 18-29.

¹²⁵Mt. 5:29.

¹²⁶Mt. 6:2.

¹²⁷Luke 18:11-12.

¹²⁸Cf. Moore, *Judaism* II, pp. 273-275.

¹²⁹*Erubin* 13b.

¹³⁰Mt. 13:52.

¹³¹Luke 5:39.

that had not been accepted by at least some of the Pharisees. He, like his prophetic antecedents, carried on a lover's quarrel with the traditions of his people. Hence, to argue that Jesus could not have been a Pharisee because of his polemics against the Pharisees is no more plausible than to maintain that Jeremiah could not have been a patriot because he was a caustic critic of the prevailing conduct of the Judean people. Those two prophets regarded themselves as purifiers—as tearing down in order to rebuild the group from which they came—even though some of their leaders thought of them as traitors and wanted them liquidated.

Study and Discussion Questions

1. With which specific groups of his own day and country other than the Pharisees has Jesus been said to have had affinities? Do you find any of the alleged affinities plausible? Discuss.
2. To what factors does the author attribute the popular appeal of the Pharisaic party in the time of Jesus?
3. According to the author, what two distinguishing doctrines of the Pharisaic party were championed by Jesus? Discuss what other similarities the author finds between the teachings of the Pharisees and those of Jesus.
4. What, in the author's view, was the main difference between Jesus and the Pharisees? Discuss.
5. Why was the attitude of Jesus toward women remarkable for his time? Does his attitude suggest any contemporary church applications?
6. Discuss how the author explains the significant disagreements between Jesus and the Pharisees.
7. How would you respond to those who say that Jesus' criticisms of the Pharisees show that he could not have been one of their party?

Excerpt from the 1964 Instruction of the Roman Pontifical Biblical Commission.

THE HISTORICAL TRUTH OF THE GOSPELS

VI. 2. To judge properly concerning the reliability of what is transmitted in the Gospels, the interpreter should pay diligent attention to the three stages of tradition by which the doctrine and the life of Jesus have come down to us.

THREE
STAGES

VII. Christ our Lord joined to Himself chosen disciples,⁶ (Mk 3:14; Lk 6:13) saw His deeds, heard His words, and this way were equipped to be witnesses of His life and doctrine.⁸ (Lk 24:48; Jn 15:27; Acts 1:8; 10:39; 13:31.) When the Lord was orally explaining His doctrine, He followed the modes of reasoning and of exposition which were in vogue at the time. He accommodated Himself to the mentality of His listeners and saw to it that what He taught was firmly impressed on the mind and easily remembered by the disciples. These men understood the miracles and other events of the life of Jesus correctly as deeds performed or designed that men might believe in Christ through them, and embrace with faith the doctrine of salvation.

(1)
MINISTRY
OF
JESUS

VIII. The apostles proclaimed above all the death and resurrection of the Lord, as they bore witness to Jesus.⁹ (Lk 24:44-48; Acts 2:32; 3:15; 5:30-32.) They faithfully explained His life and words,¹⁰ (Acts 10:36-41) while taking into account in their method of preaching the circumstances in which their listeners found themselves.¹¹ (Compare Acts 13:16-41 with Acts 17:22-31.) After Jesus rose from the dead and His divinity was clearly perceived,¹² (Acts 10:36-41) faith, far from destroying the memory of what had transpired, rather confirmed it, because their faith rested on the things which Jesus did and taught.¹³ (Acts 2:22; 10:37-39.) Nor was He changed into a "mythical" person and His teaching deformed in consequence of the worship which the disciples from that time on paid Jesus as the Lord and the Son of God. On the other hand, there is no reason to deny that the apostles passed on to their listeners what was really said and done by the Lord with that fuller understanding which they enjoyed,¹⁴ (Jn 2:22; 12:16; 11:51-52; cf. 14:26, 16:12-13; 5:39) having been instructed by the glorious events of the Christ and taught by the light of the Spirit of Truth.¹⁵ (Jn 14:26; 16:13) So, just as Jesus Himself after His resurrection "interpreted to them"¹⁶ (Lk 24:27) the words of the Old Testament as well as His own,¹⁷ (Lk 24:44-45; Acts 1:3.) they too interpreted His words and deeds according to the needs of their listeners. "Devoting themselves to the ministry of the word,"¹⁸ (Acts 6:4) they preached and made use of various modes of speaking which were suited to their own purpose and the mentality of their listeners. For they were debtors¹⁹ (I Cor 9:19-23) "to Greeks and barbarians, to the wise and the foolish."²⁰ (Rom 1:14.)

(2)
APOSTOLIC
PREACHING

But these modes of speaking with which the preachers proclaimed Christ must be distinguished and (properly) assessed: Catecheses, stories, testimonia, hymns, doxologies, prayers--and other literary forms of this sort which were in Sacred Scripture and were accustomed to be used by men of that time.

IX. This primitive instruction, which was at first passed on by word of mouth and then in writing--for it soon happened that many tried "to compile a narrative of the things"²¹ (Lk 1:1) which concerned the Lord Jesus--was committed to writing by the sacred authors in four Gospels for the benefit of the churches, with a method suited to the peculiar purpose which each (author) set for himself. From the many things handed down they selected some things, reduced others to a synthesis, (still) others they explicated as they kept in mind the situation of the churches. With every (possible) means they sought that their readers might become aware of the reliability²² (Lk 1:4) of those words by which they had been instructed. Indeed, from what they had received the sacred writers above all selected the things which were suited to the various situation of the faithful and to the purpose which they had in mind, and adapted their narration of them to the same situations and purpose. Since the meaning of a statement also depends on the sequence, the Evangelists, in passing on the words and deeds of our Savior, explained these now in one context, now in another, depending on (their) usefulness to the readers. Consequently, let the exegete seek out the meaning intended by the Evangelist in narrating a saying or a deed in a certain way or in placing it in a certain context. For the truth of the story is not at all affected by the fact that the Evangelists relate the words and deeds of the Lord in a different order,²³ (cf. John Chrysostom, Hom. In Matth. 1, 3 Pg. 57, 16-17) and express his saying not literally but differently, while preserving (their) sense²⁴ (Augustine, De consensu Evangelistarum 2, 12, 28 [Pl 34, 1090-91; CSEL 43, 127-29]) For, as St. Augustine says, "It is quite probable that each Evangelist believed it to have been his duty to recount what he had to in that order in which it pleased God to suggest it to his memory--in those things at least in which the order, whether it be this or that, detracts in nothing from the truth and authority of the Gospel. But why the Holy Spirit, who apportions individually to each one as He wills,²⁵ (I Cor 12:11) and who therefore undoubtedly also governed and ruled the minds of the holy (writers) in recalling what they were to write because of the pre-eminent authority which the books were to enjoy, permitted one to compile his narrative in this way, and another in that, anyone with pious diligence may seek the reason and with divine aid will be able to find it."²⁶ (De consensu Evangelistarum 2, 21 51-52 [PL 34, 1102; CSEL ,153])

(3)
SACRED
AUTHORS

NB

X. Unless the exegete pays attention to all these things which pertain to the origin and composition of the Gospels and makes proper use of all the laudable achievements of recent research,

he will not fulfil his task of probing into what the sacred writers intended and what they really said. From the results of the new investigations it is apparent that the doctrine and the life of Jesus were not simply reported for the sole purpose of being remembered, but were "preached" so as to offer the Church a basis of faith and of morals. The interpreter (then), by tirelessly scrutinizing the testimony of the Evangelists, will be able to illustrate more profoundly the perennial theological value of the Gospels and bring out clearly how necessary and important the Church's interpretation is.

II The Canon of Scripture: Canon → $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\omega\varsigma$ → ganu = Babylonian word for reed = rod = standard.

A. Marcion:

- Life:** born son of bishop of Sinope in Pontus (Black Sea); became wealthy ship owner, excommunicated by his father, comes to Rome circa 140. In July 144 excommunicated at Rome, sets up his own Church w/ bishops, priests & deacons, liturgy like Roman Church, by 160 widespread in Roman Empire, some continued to exist in Syria until 800 A.D.
 for business purposes - systematically to root out all X-inity from Turkey - faces the Euxine
- Significance:** because of Marcion's rejection of some of the Christian writings and all of the Septuagint it was urgent for the Christian community to articulate what writings were accepted as normative and if they were so, why were they so accepted.
 where ever Marcion ships went there went faith by 170 1/3 Pax's
- Doctrine:** expressed in Marcion's book Antitheses. (No copy survives, only fragments in Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses). Marcion taught the following:
 God of Jesus was not God of the OT. Jesus does not fulfill the prophecies of the OT.
 God of OT ↔ God of Jesus
 1) just 1) good
 2) inferior 2) superior
 3) is demiurge who formed world + men out of matter: seed of evil. 3) is totally spiritual, helps world + mankind overcome matter: No marriage or sexual activity of any kind: sex is evil.
 4) is male, revengeful + warlike 4) is loving, forgiving, peaceable
demiurge median between spiritual + physical 1st creation "patty-cake maker" ἀντίθεσις
continuing enslaving man into matter
over-sea convert

∴ OT tells us nothing about Jesus. The Jews, especially the OT ὀρθόδοξοι ὁμολογοῦντες of the diaspora, perverted Jesus' message.

∴ To recover Jesus' message, one must reject the OT, the Gospel of Mt, Mk, Jn because they reflect Judaism. Reject also all letters of Paul that seem "Jewish", e.g., Pastoral letters + Hebrews. Marcion accepts only some letters of St. Paul and the second half of the Gospel of St. Luke. These are his $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (writings - scripture) = Gospel (portions of Luke) + Apostle (5 letters of St. Paul, edited to remove "Jewish" influence) and the way to understand the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ are to read them in the light of Marcion's Antitheses. In the Antitheses Marcion taught that Jesus was not born of Mary. Jesus had neither birth, nor growth but appeared at age 30 in Capernaum as "manifestation" of superior God. Jesus destroyed the god of the OT (demiurge) by his miracles + his blood. By following Jesus' "pure" teaching, the soul can be redeemed whereas the

and struggle w/ demiurge metaphor Doctrine

11 A. 3 (cont.) "body" and all material things still remain subject to the "dead" "demiurge" (god of OT). The "soul" may escape to "new life" through mysterious sacraments and rigid self-denial (strict diet, bodily exercise, no sexual activity).

4. Reaction to Marcion:

- a) establish canon - ^{5th and 6th century} + go back to origin - develop idea tradition
- b) development of concept of tradition (rule of faith + life)
- c) how to interpret the OT and show the relation of OT to NT
 - i) allegorical method (like Philo)
 - ii) historical-literal method

B. How soon were the Christian writings (cf I C 2 b.) considered $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota$?

1. $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota$ = scripture = Septuagint
2. 2 Peter 3:15-16 "In Paul's letters ($\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$) there are some passages hard to understand. The unlearned and unstable twist the meaning of these to their own destruction, as they do also the rest of Scripture ($\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\iota\gamma\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota\varsigma$)"

C. What determined which Christian writings would be accepted as $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota$?

1. preserved or kept e.g. Loss of Paul's Epistola lacrymarum (Letter of tears) to the Corinthians cf. Cor 5:3-11; Loss of the "Q" Logia (sayings) in Aramaic.
2. accepted to form New Testament (Novum Testamentum = New Covenant; first used by Tertullian circa 200) e.g. Sometime 'acceptance' of 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Didache, Hermas, Barnabas - but finally not "accepted".

a) By whom were they accepted? Councils (cf. Theme IV)

b) On what criteria were they accepted?

i) Apostolic origin \rightarrow authorship (in the broad sense)

Syria - Mt, Jude, James (James is modeled on Stoic diatribe)

Greece + Asia Minor - Pauline + Johannine writings, Acts, Luke (?)

Rome + Alexandria - Mk, Romans, Hebrews, Luke (?)

NB No work directly from Palestinian community. Why? 66-70 "Jewish War"

Jn. describes geo- to well must have been eye witness - prior to 66-70

II C 2₁₆

- ii) Community addressed
history of the community -
importance of the community - large community
- iii) Rule of faith - doctrine expressed in the writing. Note that the community (a local Christian Church) records its tradition and the other Churches judge whether a writing agrees and expresses the living faith that they share
- iv) Rule of usage - consistent & constant usage of books later than the Septuagint OT
liturgy ^{is} church at prayer

D. When did this acceptance come?

NB Canon (law) 60 of the Council of Laodicea in 360 AD and the Decree of Damasus of 380 A.D. are spurious - frauds

325 Council of Nicea

393 Council of Hippo

397 Council of Carthage

419 Council of Hippo ... The African canon becomes normative for the Western Church

692 Quinisextine Council (Trullo II) at Constantinople still expresses doubts about accepting into the Canon Apocalypse, Hebrews, James, Jude, 1 Peter + 2 Peter

1441 February 4 Council of Florence

1546 April 8 Council of Trent

A.J. Ryan, S.J.

III. Development of the Ordained Ministry

A. Confessional Problem: What is the nature of the ordained ministry?

1. There is only the priesthood of all the baptized

i) Lutheran: preaching office (Predigamt)

ii) Reformed: Predigamt + (Diener) (John Calvin)
preaching + service to the community

2. There is a special priesthood → Eucharist → Sacrifice of Christ

3. What is the special priesthood? A charism called the 'apostolic ministry' ^{no theological agreement on charism, apostolic}

a) What is the source of the charism?

i) Holy Spirit -

ii) Ordination - seminary -

iii) Extension or Indentification of priesthood of all the baptized (a difference in degree, not an essential difference ↔ "another realm of the gifts of the Spirit")
_(as opposed to) ^{Catholic view}

iv) Apostolicity of the Church as a whole

v) Sending of the Son from the Father

Sending of the Spirit from the Father & the Risen Christ

Christ "sends" the apostles & from the "apostles" (teach & do) comes the 'apostolic ministry'

b) What is the 'apostolic ministry'? a sending (missio) which has three aspects which are simultaneously operative

i) historical = succesio

ii) visible, sacramental = ordinatio

iii) ecclesiological = communio

III
A₃

c) Is there a "model" to help in understanding the Charism of 'apostolic ministry'? Episcopē

- i) episcopē = oversight (agere in persona Christi) to act in the "person" of Christ
- ii) oversight and life of witness + preaching the Word
- iii) oversight and liturgical action
- iv) Eucharistic, liturgical episcopē = special priesthood
- v) Episcopē and ἐπισκοπος; role in Unity of Church: Communio + ordinatio + successio.

H. J. Ryan S.J.

III B2

1 Cor, 12²⁸ (52 A.D.)

ἀποστόλους (apostla)
 προφήτας (prophetai)
 διδασκάλους (teachers)
 δυναμεις (power)
 χαρισμάτων ἰσχυμάτων (heaven)
 ἀντιληψεις (helpen)
 κυβερνήσεις (governor)
 γένη γλωσσῶν (translation)

Εφλ, 4¹¹⁻¹⁶ (60 A.D.?)

ἀποστόλους
 προφήτας
 εὐαγγελιστῶν (Evangelists)
 ποιμένων (shepherds)
 διδασκάλους

1st cent. longevity
 Men 25 yr.
 Women 22 yr.

1 Peter, 5¹⁻¹⁴ (65 A.D.?)

πρεσβυτέρους — ^{eye-witness} μάρτυς (Alder-witness)
 πρεσβυτέρους (elders)

The elders are told they ought
 ποιμανατε (shepherd)
 How are the elders to shepherd the flock?

ὡς ^{eye} ^{function} ^{over} ^{word} ^{not} ^{κατά} ^{κυριεύοντες} (willingly)
 προθύμως (eagerly and not just for
 the salary paid them)
 not. ^{over} ^{word} ^{not} ^{κατά} ^{κυριεύοντες} (lording it over)

Eye-witness
 Oral Tradition

Note the following:

- 1) The fluidity and yet the hierarchic structure of the offices. The community was organized & structured even if the structures more & more & more simplification or combining of offices.
- 2) Offices #4-#8 in the 1 Cor list are combined into offices #3 & #4 in the Ephesian list and these two new "Combined" offices are placed ahead of teachers (#3 in 1 Cor, but #5 in Ephesian). The apostles evidently are choosing evangelists to receive their kerygma and placing these evangelists as "shepherds" over local Christian communities.
3. By the time of 1 Peter, the "apostle" is considering himself an "elder" and differentiates himself from the "evangelist" as an "elder" who is also an "eye witness". Thus the contraction of the offices #2-#5 in the Ephesian list to the πρεσβυτέρους — the salaried "successors of the apostle" represents a simplification & professionalisation of the New Testament community leadership.

IV MINISTRY AND ORDERS

The Ministry in the New Testament

by
REGINALD H. FULLER

SUMMARY

Modern biblical scholarship has called into question the presuppositions of traditional Anglican apologetic for episcopacy. *Acts* and the *Pastoral Epistles* are evidence not for Paul, whose Churches had purely charismatic ministries, but witness to the "early catholic" development of an ordered ministry, a development not completed until after the New Testament period. Episcopacy (and also the recognition of the priestly character of the ministry) must now be justified in terms of legitimate development.

Modern critical scholarship recognizes that the New Testament is a pluralistic book. The various authors do not speak with a single voice on any topic, save on their central witness to Jesus Christ as the saving act of God. Besides the variety of individual authors, there are three main strata in the New Testament writings: the Jesus tradition, the apostolic age, and — as modern critical scholarship is making increasingly clear (pseudonymity and later dating) — the subapostolic age. The Jesus tradition does not directly concern us for the history of the ministry in the New Testament period, but the other

MINISTRY AND ORDERS

two strata do. The apostolic age is represented by the primitive kerygmatic materials in *Acts* and Paul, by the Pauline homologoumena (1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Philemon, Romans), by the Palestinian and Hellenistic modifications and additions to the Jesus tradition in the oral stage prior to the written Gospels, and — right at the fringe of the apostolic age — by the Gospel of Mark. The subapostolic age (which I date roughly from 70 to 125) is represented in the New Testament by the Pauline antilegomena (Colossians, Ephesians, Hebrews, and the catholic epistles), by the Evangelists' redaction in Matthew and Luke, and by the compositional elements in the Johannine literature.

The Earliest Community

The Jerusalem church came into being on the foundation of Peter and the Twelve; the church spread beyond Jerusalem prior to Paul through the witness of "all the *apostoloi*" (1 Corinthians 15:7). Their precise relation to the Twelve, whether identical, overlapping or distinct, is unclear. In my view they are overlapping. It was Paul's understanding of his apostolic task that he should found churches. Some communities no doubt came into existence without direct apostolic foundation (e.g., the Hellenistic communities founded after Stephen's martyrdom, and the Roman community before the expulsion of the Jews in 48). Such foundations may be regarded as extensions of the missions of the apostles. The people who founded them were dependent on the apostles for the gospel, which focussed on Jesus Christ as the eschatological act of God to which the Twelve and all the apostles were accredited witnesses. Later on, apostles



Reggie H. Fuller's
method: Historical method

EPISCOPALIANS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS

show up at churches which were founded as extensions of their mission (e.g., Peter, Barnabas, and Paul at Antioch; Paul and — probably — Peter at Rome). Paul as an apostle continued to exercise oversight over the churches he founded by visits and correspondence.

The government and ongoing ministry in the local communities during the apostolic age presents a complex and opaque picture. At Jerusalem, James came to exercise a quasi-monarchical authority over a "sanhedrin" of elders on the Jewish model, and no doubt this sanhedrin pattern was copied in other communities of the Jewish mission (cf. James 5:14). But in the period covered by Acts the functions of this "sanhedrin" seem to have been governmental and administrative. How the ministry of word and sacrament was performed in the Palestinian communities at this period is unclear. But if the indirect hints of the special Matthean material can be taken as evidence, it would have been performed by prophets and teachers (Matthew 7:15; 23:8). At Antioch, a mixed community, partly Jewish and partly Gentile, prophets and teachers evidently exercised both governmental and pastoral-liturgical functions (Acts 13:1-3), which appears to be old tradition being contrary to Luke's redactional presentation of ministries.

The Pauline Communities

In the Pauline churches charismatic ministries seem to have been the norm. The evidence about this is clearest in 1 Corinthians 12-14 which presents us with a welter of charismatics. Listed numerically in order of importance (1 Corinthians 12:28f) are apostles, prophets and teachers, whose functions seem to have been exercised in a more or less permanent basis and so have

MINISTRY AND ORDERS

given names to the functionaries. It is surprising to find apostles in this list, since Paul normally uses the term for an accredited witness of the resurrection appointed for mission in a resurrection appearance. Here apostles are creations of the Spirit in the church. I believe Paul is here using the word in a different sense. These apostles are wandering missionaries, such as appeared in the Pauline churches, often as false apostles (2 Corinthians). They are probably a development from Antioch and the Hellenistic missionaries after Stephen.¹ The fact that they were so often false apostles led to their eventual demise, though there is evidence for their continued existence in Revelation and Didache. The prophets and teachers we have already noticed at Antioch, and they appear again here (cf. Romans 12:6-7). As the discussion in 1 Corinthians 12-14 indicates, prophets were responsible for the ministry of the word and liturgical leadership, including the recitation of the eucharistic prayer (1 Corinthians 14:16; Paul finds this being done in tongues at Corinth, but would prefer it to be done by intelligible prophecy). Teachers would be responsible for handing on catechetical tradition (cf. Romans 6:17). At Corinth the governmental functions (helps, governments) were on a different level. This is indicated by two facts: first, they are not enumerated "first," "second" and "third" as the primary charismata, and second, they are designated as charismata, not by the personal functionaries who exercise them. This suggests that such functions were performed on an *ad hoc* basis. At Philippi things were different. There Paul addresses "bishops and deacons." Evidently in this community, unlike Corinth, governmental and administrative functions hardened into quasi-permanent offices.² In the other Pauline

EPISCOPALIANS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS

communities we hear of people who exercised leadership of various kinds. We would probably not be wrong in inferring from the highly deliberate and systematic character of the list in 1 Corinthians 12, that these, like the functionaries at Philippi, were charismatics. This is contrary to the traditional view as enunciated e.g., by H. J. Carpenter, the former Bishop of Oxford, who argued¹ that 1 Corinthians 12 merely described the variety of functions in the one body, and does not enumerate ecclesiastical offices. The deliberately systematic character of the charismatic list shows otherwise. Other references to ministry in the Pauline homologoumena must be understood in the light of that list, not vice versa.

Ordination in the Apostolic Age

The homologoumena never mention ordination. The inference that it was practiced in the Pauline churches rests upon Acts 14 and 20 and the Pastorals, that is, evidence which according to modern critical opinion comes from the subapostolic age, not from the Pauline period. It would seem that the charismata welled up as it were spontaneously in the communities (cf. Stephen as in 1 Corinthians 16:15). Such a view was rejected by conservative Anglican apologetic, but I am glad that it finds support from that critical though Catholic-minded Episcopalian scholar, Burton Scott Easton.⁴

On the other hand it is reasonable to suppose that, in the Palestinian communities, the elders would have been ordained by the laying on of hands, since it was already Jewish practice,⁵ though this is admittedly an argument from silence. However, it must be remembered that these elders performed governmental, not pastoral-liturgical, functions. There, too, the prophets and teachers

MINISTRY AND ORDERS

would presumably have been charismatic, but not ordained. At the same time, it must also be remembered that strictly pastoral-liturgical functions, at least in the Pauline communities, which is all we know about, were under the supervision and control of the apostles.

The Subapostolic Period

In turning to the ministry during the subapostolic age, we find that the evidence falls into two main groups, an earlier and a later. The earlier group consists of Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Peter 1-4:11; the later group of 1 Peter 4:12-end, Acts and Pastorals.

The Earlier Subapostolic Writings

We have already noted a certain hardening of ecclesiastical office in the bishops and deacons of Philippians 1:1 towards the end of the Pauline period. This tendency is further mirrored in an early deutero-Pauline charismatic list, namely Ephesians 4:11-16, which is clearly modeled on the Pauline lists (1 Corinthians 12:28, Romans 12:6f). It is similarly systematic, featuring the pre-eminent charismata by connecting particles, *men . . . de . . . de*. But there are changes. The charismata are now the gifts of the ascended Christ, not of the Spirit in the Church. There is a change in the items in the list. Apostles are still first, and prophets second, but the third place is taken by evangelists, while what was originally the third item, the teachers, is now placed fourth and expanded to include "shepherds." I take it though that pastors and teachers refer to a single office, for they are included within a common article. Ephesians, an "early catholic" writing, looks back on the apostles and prophets as belonging to the now post-apostolic age. The

"evangelists" will be immediate successors of the apostles, people like the actual authors of the deutero-Pauline letters and of the catholic epistles, as opposed to the apostolic names which they bear. These are the group whom Bishop Gore designated as "apostolic men." They possess authority over groups of churches, and can address these churches over the heads of their local leadership, and over the local leaders themselves. The shepherds and teachers form the local leadership. The community addressed in this letter has brought together the originally separate functions for teaching and government. This is the germ of the *presbuteroi* as they appear later in Acts and Pastorals. Meanwhile, the minor charismata have disappeared from the picture entirely.

There is still nothing about ordination in Ephesians: the ministries are still freely charismatic, though it is now the ascended Christ who appoints them. This prepares the way for the emergence of ordination for the presbyter-bishops as we shall see in the later group of subapostolic writings.

Hebrews, though its evidence is scanty, belongs to roughly the same stage of development as Ephesians, which is not surprising since it has some definite relation with the deutero-Pauline literature. Hebrews 13:17 refers to the "leaders" (*hegoumenoi*). Here a personal description of a church office is intended. There are traces of this term applied similarly to a church office in Luke 22:26, the remodelling of a Jesus saying in the light of developing church order.⁷ They appear in early catholic writings outside the New Testament (1 Clement, Hermas). All the emphasis in Hebrews is on the proper relation of the leaders to the "saints" (*Hagioi*, the ordinary members of the community).⁸ Their functions

include, like the pastor-teachers of Ephesians, both ministry of the word (13:37) and governmental-pastoral duties (vs. 17), i.e., the care of souls. This church office the original founders also shared (cf. fellow-elder Peter in 1 Peter 5:1). This suggests some incipient notion of apostolic succession. Nothing is said in Hebrews of their charismatic status. Buchsel comments: "Whether the leaders are chosen by the community or appointed by their predecessors, whether they are charismatics or how they are related to the charismatics . . . remains obscure. Their authority is stressed, but it resides not in their persons but in their function: they must give account for their care of souls." On the other hand, Otto Michel in his commentary on Hebrews (*ad loc*) observes that the way in which their authority rests upon the word they proclaim suggests that they may still have been free charismatics, though not of the fanatic type. In them the Spirit, as Paul would insist, is subject to the criterion of the Word. In my opinion, the leaders of Hebrews represent a transition from the free charismatic to institutional office.

1 Peter 4:11 comes from the first part of the letter, which was probably a baptismal homily. It follows a common pattern in concluding an eschatological exhortation, together with an admonition to the local ministry: This is still fully charismatic (vs. 10: "as *each one* has received the *charisma*"). The charismata are shared by all members of the body. Nevertheless, the only charismata about which the writer gives specific injunctions are the ministry of the word and *diakonia*. The charismata are clearly hardening into a twofold institutional ministry of the word and of *diakonia*. We are thus in a transition stage between the Pauline multiplicity of

EPISCOPALIANS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS

charismata, and a two-fold local ministry of presbyter-bishops and deacons.

The Later Subapostolic Writings of the New Testament

It is instructive to compare the passage from 1 Peter, which we have just examined, with a passage from the later part of the letter, which serves to adapt the baptismal homily as an epistle. The passage in question (1 Peter 5:1-4) speaks of *presbuteroi* (elders). But it does so in a context of exhortations to older and younger members of the church. This shows the patriarchal origin of the term *presbuteroi*. The sanhedrins in the Palestinian Christian communities had doubtless been patriarchal, as in the synagogue. But now, as the injunction to shepherd the flock in vs. 2 shows, the originally patriarchally conceived presbyters are assuming pastoral functions. In other words, the presbyterate has become a ministerial office. This takes us a little further than Ephesians 4, where there were teachers and shepherds, for the latter have now been fully institutionalized as *presbuteroi*. Correspondingly, the local congregation over which they have charge is called a "flock" (vs. 3), and significantly the exalted Christ is called the *archipoimen*, the chief Shepherd.¹⁰ The shepherds are under-shepherds of Christ, agents through whom his shepherding is made visibly and effectively present in the community. Such a development of thinking would seem to imply a permanent, institutionalized type of ministry.

Were these officers ordained? Perhaps the exhortation that they should perform their office "not under constraint, but willingly" (vs. 2) suggests this. Being appointed by ordination, they might have regarded them-

MINISTRY AND ORDERS

selves as conscripted into service! "Not for sordid financial gain" (vs. 2) suggests that they were paid officers too (cf. Pastoral epistles). "Not lording it over the flock" (vs. 3) suggests that the presbyters exercised disciplinary functions. Nothing is said about the ministry of the word, but perhaps the author who added the latter part intended the reader to apply what the earlier part, the baptismal homily, had said (1 Peter 4:11) about the charismata to this now institutionalized ministry.

Finally, note that the elders enjoy a special relation to the apostle under whose aegis this letter is written, for Peter is called a fellow-presbyter (5:1). This suggests two points. First, the pseudonymous author of the epistolary part, writing in Peter's name, claims collegiality with the local ministry, he himself being an "apostolic man" type, like the evangelists and the pseudonymous author of Ephesians. Second, the institutionalized ministry of the subapostolic generation claims a real continuity of function with the apostle, and hence, by implication, some kind of succession in office.

The second rather later writing to which we turn is Acts. The relevant passages are Acts 14:22 and 20:17-18. Unlike the older scholarship, contemporary scholarship¹¹ regards these passages, not as historical, but as redactional. That is, they reflect the ministerial set-up with which the author of Luke-Acts was familiar in the last decade of the first century. Acts 14:23 makes Paul and Barnabas ordain (*cheirotoneantes*)¹² presbyters in every city on the first missionary journey. Historically this is most improbable, for there is nothing to suggest this in the Pauline homologoumena. It is a commonly accepted methodological principle among critical New

EPISCOPALIANS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS

Testament scholars that the homologoumena must be accepted as primary evidence for Paul, and Acts only where it is consistent with the authentic Pauline evidence.¹³ But Acts 14:23 is excellent evidence for the subapostolic age. Here we have a local ministry consisting of a college of presbyters ordained in succession from the apostles. The author of Luke-Acts wants us, I think, to assume that this was regular Pauline practice. Hence in chapter 20 he can introduce elders from Ephesus who gather for Paul's farewell address. This address, which modern critical scholarship understands as a Lucan composition, is almost a compendium of subapostolic thinking on the ministry. To begin with, we note that in vs. 28 the elders are addressed as *episcopoi*, showing that at this period the two terms are synonymous. Secondly, we note that these presbyter-bishops are entrusted with the guardianship of the truth of the gospel in the period after the apostle's death, and this in face of the "wolves," false teachers (gnostics?) who will arise after the apostles' departure.

Here we have an important clue to the development of an institutionalized ministry. The free-for-all charismatic situation which prevailed in the Pauline churches is no longer acceptable in the church of the subapostolic age. Two new factors have emerged: 1) the demise of the original witnesses; 2) the threat of gnosticism and the need to preserve the truth of the gospel. Ordained ministry in succession is part (though let me emphasize only a part: there are other factors, the crystallization of the *paratheke*, i.e., the deposit of faith in credal formulae, and the gradual growth of the New Testament canon) of the attempt to subordinate the Spirit to the Word, which had been precisely Paul's concern in writ-

MINISTRY AND ORDERS

ing 1 Corinthians. It is part, I say, of the endeavor to maintain the apostolicity of the church in the period when the original apostolic witnesses are no longer around and to see that the ministry and government and pastoral care of the flock is still carried out in fidelity to that witness. Finally, let us note that the farewell address still recognizes the charismatic character of the ministry, even after it has become institutionalized. It is the Holy Spirit which makes men *episcopoi* (20:28), even though this now occurs in and through the human acts of laying on of hands and prayer. Strictly it is wrong, even though convenient, to contrast "charismatic" and institutional in speaking of the development of the ministry from the apostolic to the subapostolic age. The real contrast is between spontaneous and institutional.

The picture in the Pastoral epistles is very much the same. It is of course assumed with the majority of modern critical scholars that these letters are not by Paul, but by a later member of the Pauline school. We need not discuss the evidence in detail. The writer speaks of ministerial succession (2 Timothy 2:2). He pictures a local ministry consisting of presbyters (apparently also called bishops, but see below) and deacons. Their function is to read and proclaim the word of God, to guard the apostolic faith (*paratheke*, deposit), to administer discipline. Ordination is apparently practiced universally through the laying on of hands with prayer. The institutional character of this ministry is indicated by the fact that not only are the ministers ordained in this way, but the qualifications for their selection and arrangements for their payment are set out in detail. Here is a veritable church order.

There are of course certain residual problems. The first concerns the place of the "Timothy" and "Titus" in this scheme, and related with this the problem of the *episcopos*. Some have argued that, since the term *presbuteros* normally occurs in the plural and *episcopos* invariably in the singular, the two terms are no longer synonymous as in Acts, but that the single *episcopos* is already beginning to emerge.¹⁴ Others hold, more plausibly, that this oscillation of number is due to the fact that the author is drawing upon a traditional code (*Bischofsspiegel*).¹⁵ I think the latter is the more likely explanation for the change of number. If we are to see the germs of the monarchical episcopate (or more accurately, of the *monepiscopos*) anywhere in the past, I think we are to see it in the "Timothy" and the "Titus." It is these who have responsibility for the oversight of a plurality of churches. It is these who are responsible for the oversight and discipline of the local ministers. The "Timothy" and the "Titus" are symbols for the actual author of the Pastoral epistles, who is one of the authors who lie behind the apostolic pseudonyms used in all the literature of this period. They occupy a place midway between the apostles in the first period and the *monepiscopos* of the second century.

The ministerial functions spelled out in the Pastorals were written. It is to be noted, however, that there is no question in this period of connecting eucharistic presidency with succession. Succession is envisaged rather as the external means of handing on the apostolic tradition of faith.

Ordination, as the later New Testament writers understand it, does not necessarily mean that the charismata are the exclusive monopoly of the ordained. Even

2 Peter, for example, appeals frequently to a *consensus fidelium*. In the writings of which we are speaking, the intention is that the preeminent charismata, those which concern the ministry of word, should be exercised in the context of and under the control of the apostolic witness. As Edmund Schlink has put it as a Lutheran systematician:

The relationship between Word and Spirit, between the historical uniqueness of God's salvation and the continuity of the saving Word of the Spirit (which is at the very basis of church life), finds its proper expression in the insistence on special commission. For the work of the Spirit is to stir the believer's memory; by this we mean that he is always referring back to the unique and historical saving act of Jesus Christ, and in doing this, he points back to the apostolic word, and actualizes this same salvation. Thus the Spirit and the Word are not contradictory, far from it, they belong together.¹⁶

The Priesthood

It is well-known that the New Testament studiously avoids using the term priest (*hiereus, sacerdos*) for the ministry in the church. It is confined to the Christ himself, and also used generally for the whole priestly body of the church. Two observations, however, can be made: in the subapostolic age, sacrificial language is beginning to be used of the eucharist (Hebrews 13: 10 and 15). The language of 1 Peter 2: 1-10, applied to the whole priestly body, while having a deliberately ethical slant, implies that the concrete focus of the priestly activity of the whole body is liturgical and cultic. "Showing forth the

EPISCOPALIANS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS

praises of him who called us from darkness into his own marvelous light" is an apt description of the contents of the great eucharistic prayer. Moreover, Paul has already used priestly language of his own apostolic ministry of bringing Gentile converts into the *ecclesia* (Romans 15:15).

From a New Testament point of view, therefore, it would seem to be at once hazardous and justifiable to use the term "priest" of a Christian minister. It is hazardous because it can easily suggest that the Old Testament priesthood abolished by Christ is being revived, because it can obscure the scriptural doctrines of the finality of Christ's high-priesthood, or obscure the priesthood of the whole body of the church. It is justified because at the very lowest level the minister is as much a sharer in the priesthood of the whole body as any of the non-ministerial members of the body. And more than that, it is the minister who has the particular responsibility of articulating and expressing the priesthood of the whole body. In this sense, then, he must be a priest. But the New Testament would seem to justify a functional, rather than ontological concept of priesthood. And the word "priest" (except when it is equivalent to "presbyter," one of the ambiguities of the English and other modern European languages) ought to be used only when we are speaking in a functional context.

Does the pluralism of the New Testament mean that any kind of ministry is legitimate ("Everyone has won, and all shall have prizes")? Or does it mean that the New Testament witnesses to a process that is as yet incomplete, that certain lines have been established which will eventually converge towards the stabilized institutions of the patristic church? The latter has been the

MINISTRY AND ORDERS

position of Anglicanism, and it is reinforced by the modern critical study of the New Testament. Speaking of episcopacy, the Lambeth Bishops wrote in 1930:

The Episcopate occupies a position which is, in point of historical development, analogous to that of the Canon of Scripture and the creeds. In the first days there was no Canon of the New Testament Scripture, for the books afterwards included in it were still being written. For a time, different churches had different writings which they regarded as authoritative. The Canon was slowly formed and the acceptance of a single Canon throughout the Church took several generations. So, too, the Apostles' Creed is the result of a process of growth which we can in large measure trace. If the Episcopate, as we find it universally by the end of the second century, was the result of a like process of adaptation and growth, that would be no evidence that it lacked divine authority, but rather that the life of the Spirit within the Church had found it to be the most appropriate organ for the functions it discharged."

We can only justify our institutions in terms of legitimate development. This applies to priesthood, episcopacy, and succession. Could it also, for Anglicans, legitimate the development of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome?

IV

C. Which 'priesthood' does the 'ordained' ministry have?

1. Biblical background:

a) Epistle to the Hebrews - written after destruction of Jerusalem Temple (70 A.D.), interprets the work of Jesus in the light of what the Jewish priesthood had been. It is the only canonical writing which makes Christ the Priest accomplish 'once for all' and in a perfect way the priestly work willed by God thus replacing the priests and the cultic sacrifices of the people of God. Yet, Jesus is not hierous (priest) after the pattern of the Hebrew Jerusalem clergy whose function centered upon the ritual acts of a cult in danger of becoming merely external. Jesus "fulfills" the longing for authentic worship, allowing man himself to enter into communion with God, into the work of the Covenant. The death of Jesus is the sacrificial act par excellence, not only because of its result, but because of its quality. The death of Jesus is the unique human act reconciling humanity with the Father "once for all" and it crowns his voluntary sharing of the lot of man. One alone is thus true hierous, he who has entered through his own life's blood into the sanctuary of God.

b) Letter - now affirms that Christ is hierous, sees Christ rather as victim of the sacrifice (1 Peter 2, 21-25; 4, 1). Written about 65 from Rome as a letter on the Christian life incorporating many themes in a baptismal exhortation. This letter of Peter (authorship in the broad sense) applies to Christians the expression of the book of Exodus, 19, 6 "you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood (basileion hierodouma), eg. 1 Peter, 2, 9-10

ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα,
you indeed [are a] race chosen, [a] royal priesthood,

λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε
[a] people for possession so that the virtues you may proclaim
τοῦ ἐκ σκοτῆς ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμάσιον
of him who out of darkness you having called into the marvelous
αὐτοῦ φῶς.
of him light

C. 2. Priesthood and Sacrifice (priests offered sacrifice, did not slay victims)

- i) OT sacrifice - the central act of Israelite worship cf. Leviticus 1-7.
 holocaust → LXX holocauston → Heb. 'ōlā - "to go up" completely burned & smoke
 "went up", to "go up in smoke" → Heb. kalil = complete DT 33,10

Communion sacrifice → zebah š'lamim

tōdā = sacrifice of praise Leviticus 7,12-15

n'dabā = freewill sacrifice, made out of pure devotion Lev 7,16-17

nedor = made in fulfillment of a vow Lev 22,18-23

sacrifice of expiation

kattā't = sin offering, dignity of one making the offering determined
 the victim to be offered, high priest a bull, prince (nāsi'), etc. goat
 these sacrifices, the blood of the victim was poured by the priest on the
 altar or sprinkled on the veil of the Holy of Holies.

W.B. The Eucharist in the Hebrew Scriptures considers Jesus' death a kattā't in which he
 offers his own blood and carries it through the veil into the Holy of Holies -
 the perfect 'once for all' sacrifice for the sins of all men.

sacrifice of reparation

asām = repairing an offense

the minchā (oil, wheat, perfume)

the showbread = lechem happanīm = bread of the presence or
 face of God

ii) What did sacrifice mean in Israelite religion?

a) unsatisfactory theories

appeasement of cruel & demanding deity

quest. magical vital union

atombatic → union to God by eating victim offered to God

immolating a victim that substituted for & represented himself

meal prepared for a hungry God

b) attractive understanding of sacrifice

God was unique, personal, called for covenant response on the part of
 his people. Sacrifice was the external expression of man's personal
 response to the God who as a person had covenanted with his people.
 Sacrifice had to correspond to a sincere, interior disposition. It was
 the offering of a gift to God to express his devotion, a means of effecting
 union with him and as act of expiation - to overcome the distance
 between God & man, the unworthiness of man before God.

H.J. Ryan. S.J.

III B. The New Testament Data on the Development of the Ordained Ministry

1. Methodology: (an application of strict historical method)

a. The data must be related to:

i) time of origin both in the written & oral tradition

ii) place of origin - school of oral tradition

2) Palestinian community

β) Syria (Antioch)

γ) οἱ διασπορευόμενοι (diaspora communities)

1) Asia Minor

11) Greece

111) Alexandria

1111) Rome

b. The data must not be forced into categories which were developed only at a later date.

e.g. i) ἐπίσκοπος (bishop) does not immediately mean by what the third century means by this term, nor necessarily does ἐπίσκοπος mean the exact same thing in Acts 20²⁸, 1 Cor 2²⁵, 1 Tim 3²; Titus 1⁷.

i put my hand, someone
ii) χειροτονέω (I appoint → ordain) or τύποχειροτονέω might not have the profound sacramental significance that a later theology will see in the action. Therefore be careful not to read into 2 Cor 8¹⁹, Acts 14²³ and Acts 10⁴¹ symbolism & meaning from a later time.

c.) The data alone must not be anticipated to resolve the "Confessional Problem" (cf. III A above).

2. The major texts:

a) 1 Cor, 12²⁸

b) Ephesians 4¹¹⁻¹⁶

c) 1 Peter, 4¹⁰⁻¹¹, 5¹⁻¹⁴

Ignatius of Antioch - bishop not priest
- but "over-seeing" pastoring sacrifice once for
all

III C 3 The Patristic Evidence

Clement of Rome identifies
eucharist w/ sacrifice -
Joans w/ priesthood -

- i) Didache written at Antioch? about 70 A.D.?
- 10, 9 "let the prophets ^{blessing} eucharistise (ευχαριστειν) at will". This term "eucharistise" refers to the blessing pronounced by the person who presides and addresses to God the community's praise. Most probably this does refer to a celebration of the Lord's Supper. There is no proof that these "prophets" are charismatic who are opposed to institutional ministry.
- 15 ετις κηρυττοι και διακονοι (bishops + deacons) are mentioned only in association with the breaking of bread and the eucharist. This most probably refers to presiding at a eucharistic celebration. What the "prophets" did when they "eucharistised" was most probably offer prayer of thanks to God for what He has done for the community. It would appear that the 'prophets' did NOT consecrate the bread + wine
- 18 eucharist is considered a δωρον (sacrifice), but a "pure sacrifice" which enables the worshiper to have interior dispositions which are pleasing to God.
- 26 Though the eucharist is a sacrifice, Didache does not affirm that minister is a priest

- ii) Clement of Rome: Letter to the Corinthians written at Rome 95-98
- 40, 1 - 44, 6 same vision as Epistle to the Hebrews but Joans in ερμηνευς {36, 1
61, 3
64, 1
- 40, 5 Clement does not confer upon the ministers of the Christian community the specific priesthood of the ministers of the Levitical order but he sees Christian ministry as sacerdotal, as having a Ταξις
- 44, 4 presbyters ought to offer the gifts (δωρα) in a devout, unperishable way
- Though Clement begins the analogy of Christian ministry with the Book of Leviticus, but does not use the term 'priest' to describe Christian ministers

- iii) Ignatius of Antioch: +107
- ad Phil 9, 1 Joans is High Priest surpassing the priests of Israel
- Eph 5, 2; ad Phil 4, 9; ad Trall, 7, 2; Magna 6, 2 emphasises ετις κηρυττοι (bishop) surrounded by his presbytery (a college of presbyters) and his deacons during eucharist, stresses explanation of eucharist in terms of sacrificial language of OT, yet NEVER calls ετις κηρυττοι, ιηρευσ (bishop a priest in sense of ιηρευσ).

- iv) Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho the Jew written at Rome circa 158
- 116, 1-3 describe the ministers or the eucharistic synaxis but reserve the word 'priest' exclusively for Joans.

IV C 3 (cont.)

- 1) Testallian: Colleges in Africa: first to call Christian ministers priest (sacerdos)
the baptism written in 171

17, 1-2 the power to confer baptism rests in the first place with the higher priest (sacerdos sacerdos), i.e., with the bishop if he is present; after him, with the presbyter and with the deacon, but never without the bishop's authorisation... The laity also have the power (laici potest).

18 explicit distinction between hierarchical ministers, with bishop only called priest, even though presbyters & deacons are associated with the sacerdos, and the laity

the Prescriptions written in 210

41, 6 underlines distinction which exists between ordained ministers & laymen

41, 8 uses "ordination" in technical sense, incorporation into an ordo of ministry

the Pudicitia written in 217-220 (Irenaeus is now a Montanist)

20, 6 compares disciplinary practice of Christian sacerdotes with Jewish priests

20, 10 Jesus is "Summus Sacerdos Patris" - High Priest of the Father

21, 16 in the official Catholic Church (Irenaeus has left the Catholic Church) the function of the forgiveness of sins is tied to the priesthood

- (1) Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus (ΠΕΡΙ ΧΑΡΙΣΜΑΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΣΙΣ)
 written at Rome, circa 220, gives the liturgical formula for ordination used at Rome about 210-220

a bishop is to perform the Father's holy work and exercise toward the Father
 the sovereign priesthood (ἀρχιεπισκοπικὴν; primatum sacerdotii)
 he is to offer the gifts (donum, dona sancta)

resist sin

disturbance burden

love from every bond in virtue of the power God has given the apostles

in the ordination of a presbyter, all presbyters impose their hands because there is participation in a common spirit

the deacon is NOT ordained in sacramentum, but the prayer recorded as a deacon's ordination is marked with references to the Old Testament sanctuary where a high priest serves other the deacons must assist.

III

4. (cont.) It is the opinion of J. H. Elliott, The Elect and the Holy, An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2, 4-13 and the phrase basilikon hierodoma. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Leiden, 1966 that this text should be interpreted as follows. This text of 1 Peter must be understood in the light of what Exodus was saying about Israel. Because of its election and because of the gift of the Spirit, the People, composed of the baptized and saved by the Passover of Christ, is bound to God with bonds of holiness. It thus becomes basilikon, a royal dwelling-place, a temple radiating the glory of God. Its mission with respect to the pagan world will be carried out through the holiness of its life. Thus it is the daily working out of their life and conduct which makes the Christians "living stones entering into the construction of a spiritual building, for a holy priesthood (sic hierodoma regia), with a view to offering spiritual sacrifices (preu matikan thumia) acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." Cf. 1 Peter 2, 5. Therefore the statement "a holy body of priests to offer spiritual sacrifices" designates the believing community as the elect, holy and priestly people of God, whose task is the communication of the word of his mighty acts and the leading of a holy life as a witness to men and as Spirit-empowered oblations acceptable to God.

These 'sacrifices' are not ritual acts. To see in the 'royal priesthood' the power which every Christian possesses by the very fact of his baptism to take an active part in the ritual cult and especially in the Eucharist is to falsify the thought of the text. Surely the holiness of Christian life is an effect of the priesthood of Christ in the sense of the Ekklesia to the Hebrews. But 1 Peter does not seek to explain the 'holy priesthood' of Christian believers, of all the baptized, as a transmission of Christ's 'priesthood' to the Christian community.

H. J. Ryan. O. S. B.

III c 4 Conclusion: In Christian usage there are 5 priesthoods

1. Levitical, Jewish cultic priesthood of Old Testament
2. The unique priesthood of Jesus Christ that fulfills, completes and supersedes the Levitical priesthood
3. The priesthood of all the baptized, the continuation of the residual Leviticalness of Exodus wherein the people of God offer their lives as spiritual sacrifices to God. These "spiritual sacrifices" are not cultic, ritual sacrifices, not Christian eucharists (which is the heart's passion of Calvary)
4. Ordained bishops and presbyters who are the ordained priests of the Christian Church, first called priests (sacerdotes) at the time of Tertullian and Hippolytus (the opening of the 3rd century)
5. Eucharistic priesthood - the application to ordained bishops and presbyters by the Fathers of the Church from the time of Tertullian & Hippolytus of the concept of hierēus to sacerdos by a process of assimilation to type 4 of what type 2 meant, i.e., as the Fathers reflected more & more on the meaning of Jesus' sacrificial death and the Eucharist, the ministers of the Eucharist began to be explained more & more in terms of Jesus the Priest, drawing more & more from OT models yet conscious that these Levitical models had been transcended by Jesus.

A.J. Ryan, S.J.

RS 320: Advanced Readings for Themes I+II

I. Introduction: CSNTT:

F. M. Abel, Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe. 2 vols., Gabala, Paris, 1952.

W. Foerster, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. 2 vols., Im Fische, Hamburg. I Das Judentum Palästinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel. 1959; II Das römische Weltreich zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments. 1956.

S. Perowne, The Later Herods: The Political Background of the New Testament. Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1958.

N. de Jonge & S. Laprai (Editors), Compendia rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Fortress, Philadelphia, 1976. Cf. Section 1, volume 2, S. Laprai & M. Stern with D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik (Editors), The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions. Fortress, Philadelphia, 1976, 1-582.

A. Hebrew Background:

Cecil Roth, A History of the Jews. Schocken Books, N. Y., 1970

Frederick Schweitzer, A History of the Jews Since the First Century A.D. Macmillan, N. Y., 1976.

Cecil Roth (Editor), The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia. Doubleday, Garden City, N. Y., 1972.

B. The Hellenistic Background:

- J. M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. 2 vols., Oxford, 1957.
- A. H. M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire. 3 vols., Oxford, 1964.
- R. Mac Mullen, Soldier & Civilian in the Later Roman Empire. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1963.
- R. Mac Mullen, Enemies of the Roman Order. Oxford, 1967.
- A. N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship. Oxford, 1939.
- W. Westermann, The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity. American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1955.
- A. D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background. Oxford, 1964.
- Peter Brown, The World of Late Antiquity AD 150-750. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, New York, 1974.
- S. Borge & J. J. O'Rourke, Early Church History: The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity. Oliphant, London, 1972.
- C. N. Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine, Oxford Univ. Press, N. Y., 1968.
- Ronald Nudley, Roman Society. Pelican, Harmondsworth, 1975.
- P. R. Coleman-Norton, Roman State and Christian Church. SPCK, London, 3 vols., 1966.
- R. M. Grant, Augustus to Constantine. Harper & Row, N. Y., 1973.

I B. (cont.)

Michael Grant, The Fall of the Roman Empire: A Reappraisal.
The Annenberg School Press, Nelson Ltd., London, 1976, 1-336.

C. Who was Jesus?

L. W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Harvard Theological Studies, Cambridge, Mass., 1976

H. W. Attridge, The Presentation of Biblical History in the "Antiquitates Judaicae" of Flavius Josephus. Harvard Dissertations in Religion, Cambridge, Mass., 1976.

J. C. Lager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism. Abingdon, Nashville, 1972.

H. D. Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Abingdon, Nashville, 1976.

C. H. Talbert, Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts. Abingdon, Nashville, 1974.

J. R. Donahue, Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark. Society of Biblical Literature, University of Montana, Missoula, 1975.

J. J. Collins, The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism. SBL, University of Montana, Missoula, 1976.

J. A. Fitzmyer, J., Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. SBL, University of Montana, Missoula, 1973.

R. M. Grant, Historical Introduction to the New Testament. Harper

1st Rev. N. Y. 1963
R. A. Spivey and D. M. Smith, Anatomy of the New Testament. Macmillan, New York, 1969.

J. D. M. Derlet, Jesus' Audience. Seabury, N. Y., 1974.

**ALEXANDER CAMPBELL: THE GREATEST EVANGELIST FOR
THE AMERICAN COVENANT; OR THE BIGGEST FAILURE?**

by

Tracy J. Gamble

**A Paper Submitted to Father Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.
of the Religious Studies Department**

of Loyola Marymount University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

RS 385

December 1

1975

Index

Bibliography i, ii, iii, iv

Journal Entries: November 10, 1975 1-8

Conclusion 8-9

*St. Ambrose: the Impeccable
Arch Bishop of Milan*

Bibliography

Braden, Gayle Anderson, and Cotalie Jones Runyon. A History of the Christian Church. Lexington: The Official Board of the Maysville Christian Church, 1948.

Brown, John T. Churches of Christ. Louisville: John P. Morgan and Company, 1904.

Butler, Lorine Letcher. History of First Christian Church. Lexington: The Keystone Printers, Incorporated, 1960.

Campbell, Alexander. Acts of the Apostles, Translated From the Greek, On the Basis of the Common English Version, With Notes (by Alexander Campbell). New York: American Bible Union, 1857.

Campbell, Alexander. Christian Baptism: With its Antecedents and Consequents. Bethany, Virginia: Printed and Published by Alexander Campbell, 1851.

Campbell, Alexander. The Christian System...4th edition; Bethany, Virginia: Alexander Campbell, 1857.

Campbell, Alexander, and Right Reverend John B. Purcell. "A Debate on the Roman Catholic Religion..." Cincinnati: J. A. James and Company, 1837.

Campbell, Alexander, and Robert Owen. "The Evidences of Christianity; A Debate Between Robert Owen and Alexander Campbell." 5th stereotyped edition; Cincinnati: American Christian Publication Society, 1854.

Campbell, Alexander. "Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch." St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1901.

Campbell, Alexander. "Popular Lectures and Addresses." Philadelphia: James Challen and Son, 1863.

Campbell, Alexander. The Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, Commonly Styled the New Testament. Buffalo, Brooke County, Virginia: Alexander Campbell, 1826.

Campbell, Alexander. The Writings of Alexander Campbell, Selections Chiefly From the "Millennial Harbinger", edited by W. A. Morris. Austin, Texas: Eugene Von Broeckman, 1896.

Cauble, Commodore Wesley. Disciples of Christ in Indiana. Indianapolis: Meigs Publishing Company, 1930.

Eames, S. Morris. The Philosophy of Alexander Campbell. Bethany: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966.

- Fortune, Alonzo Willard. Adventuring With Disciple Pioneers. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1942.
- Fortune, Alonzo Willard. "The Disciples in Kentucky." St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1932.
- Garrison, James Harvey. The Reformation of the Nineteenth Century. St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1901.
- Garrison, Winfred E. An American Religious Movement. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1945.
- Garrison, Winfred E., and Alfred T. DeGroot. The Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1931.
- Garrison, Winfred E., and Alfred T. DeGroot. Whence and Wither Disciples of Christ. 3rd printing; St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1950.
- Gates, Errett. The Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples. Chicago: The Christian Century Company, 1904.
- Hailey, Homer. Attitudes and Consequences in the Restoration Movement. 2nd edition; Rosemead, California: The Old Paths Book Club, 1952.
- Hall, Colby D. History of Texas Disciples. Ft. Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1953.
- Harmon, Marion F. "A History of the Christian Churches in Mississippi." Aberdeen, Mississippi: 1929.
- Haynes, Nathaniel S. History of the Disciples of Christ in Illinois. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1915.
- Hodge, Frederick Arthur. The Plea and the Pioneers in Virginia. Richmond: Everett Waddey Company, 1905.
- Humbert, Royal, editor. A Compend of Alexander Campbell's Theology. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1963.
- Jennings, Walter Wilson. Origin and Early History of the Disciples of Christ. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1919.
- Lewis, Grant K. The American Christian Missionary Society and the Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1937.

Lindley, D. R. Apostle of Freedom, Alexander Campbell. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1957.

Lunger, H. L. The Political Ethics of Alexander Campbell. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1954.

McAllister, L. G. Thomas Campbell: Man of the Book. St. Louis, Bethany Press, 1954.

McPherson, Chalmers. Disciples of Christ in Texas. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1920.

Moore, William Thomas. A Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1909.

Moseley, J. Edward. Disciples of Christ in Georgia. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954.

Murch, James DeForest. Christians Only. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1962.

Peterson, Orval D. Washington and Northern Idaho Disciples: A History. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1945.

Shaw, Henry K. Buckeye Disciples. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1952.

Spencer, Claude E. An Author Catalog of Disciples of Christ and Related Religious Groups. Canton, Missouri: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1946.

Spencer, Claude E. Periodicals of the Disciples of Christ and Related Religious Groups. Canton, Missouri: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1943.

Swander, Clarence F. Making Disciples in Oregon. Portland: published by Clarence F. Swander, 1928.

Walker, Dean E. Adventuring for Christian Unity. Birmingham: The Berean Press, 1935.

Ware, Charles Crossfield. North Carolina Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publications, 1927.

Ware, Elias B. History of the Disciples of Christ in California. Heraldsburg, California: F. W. Cooke, Publisher, 1916.

Wilcox, Alanson. A History of the Disciples of Christ in Ohio. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1918.

Woolery, William K. Bethany Years. Huntington, West Virginia: Standard Printing and Publishing Company, 1941.

Young, Charles Alexander. Historical Documents Advocating Christian Union. Chicago: The Christian Century Company, 1904.

Journal Entries: November 10-17, 1975

My grandmother, Adelaide Campbell Robinson-Kilfeather, never ceased to relish in the glory of "the Campbells of Virginia" and her lineage that boasts a remote great uncle named Alexander Campbell, the founder of Bethany College and the founder of the Disciples of Christ. My interest in this man grew with my grandmother's stories and increased when I learned that such men as Lyndon Baines Johnson had been members of this denomination. I decided to research Alexander Campbell in order to determine how important this denomination became, what it preached different from any other denomination, and if Alexander Campbell himself, in founding President Johnson's church, contributed anything to the notion of civil religion in the United States.

Remote interest has remained with me until this day when I turned to the New Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume II, 1967. The blurb about the son of Scotch-Irish Presbyterian parents, his father a minister, is interesting to say the least. Alexander had joined his father's Christian Association of Washington, Pennsylvania, and had been ordained in 1812. Alexander Campbell had developed personal insights and views concerning Christianity. He had felt that the only requisites for Christianity were belief in Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and Baptism. He had spread his views evangelically in the Midwest and South, causing a substantial exodus from the strong Baptist congregations.

Campbell organized, later, with churches formed by Barton Stone to form the Disciples of Christ in 1832. He founded Bethany College in 1849 feeling the need for an educated ministry for his simplistic theology.

I have certain impressions and am sensitized for further research to look for the notion of Americans as a covenanted people. I feel now, at the very least, Alexander Campbell must have had an impact upon this notion. His acceptance of Jesus the Messiah is anti-non-denominational Protestant school of thought, as well as anti-Deist and anti-Unitarian. But Alexander Campbell had utilized the vehicle of the Great Awakening which had led to the latter schools of thought--that is, evangelism. The Baptists, certainly, are a strong and large denomination in the melting pot of America. What did Alexander Campbell do in order to deplete their numbers in the 1800's? Did he abandon his Presbyterian heritage?

Thus, I can see that some impact must have come from this one man, and I shall look to find whether Alexander Campbell fed the notion of covenant among American peoples, or whether he did his best to impede it.

I turned to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Volume IV, 1970 revised edition, and found the greatest influences upon Alexander Campbell's life: his father, Thomas Campbell, and John Locke the philosopher. Thomas Campbell had abandoned Presbyterianism and felt his goal should be the unification of all Christians. The vehicle would be evangelism.

Alexander Campbell, upon arrival and ordination, became the leader of this religious reform in America. I suppose it was his youth, vitality, and eloquence that suited him for the leadership role.

Biblical study led Alexander Campbell and his followers to join the Baptists in 1813 because they deeply felt immersion necessary for salvation. However, other aspects of the Baptists caused friction and tension with Alexander Campbell, who left them in 1830.

It is interesting to note that another major influence upon Alexander Campbell was the philosopher John Locke, who had influenced our "Founding Fathers" as well. Locke's epistemology influenced Campbell to present a rationalistic Christianity based on the New Testament and to oppose speculative theology and emotional revivalism.

Campbell became politically involved with the United States as a member of the constitutional convention of Virginia in 1829. He died a wealthy land owner, and lived lavishly in Virginia.

Alexander Campbell's cravings for unity and his emulation of John Locke, along with the man's apparent interest in civil society, brings my subject closer to the notion of American covenant. Perhaps the covenant then existing, based on the Old Testament Mosaic Covenant, was being challenged by Alexander Campbell. Perhaps Alexander Campbell wanted to covenant all Americans with Christ and the New Testament, thus renovating the old Mosaic tradition passed down through the Puritans.

Turning to the Encyclopedia Americana, I discovered two interesting points about Alexander Campbell that deal specifically with the notion of covenant, and Campbell's possible influence upon civil society:

1. The Baptists had wanted to oust the Campbells for vagrant liberalism concerning members of the congregation, and Baptism. Apparently, anyone was welcome in Thomas Campbell's and his son's church. Thus, the Campbells intended to extend the notion of covenant with Christ.

2. So well known a debater was Alexander Campbell, that he was invited to speak before the House of Representatives of the United States.

S. Morris Eames' The Philosophy of Alexander Campbell provided me with much evidence concerning my subject's role in 'covenanting' Americans. In America Thomas Campbell extended the Lord's Supper to Christians of any denomination. This became known as "open communion" and it modified Presbyterianism. Thomas Campbell was severely reprimanded for this action, so he left the Presbyterian Church.

The Campbells had felt that America was a rich soil for religious experimentation, and felt that Christ's work could be done in the "freedom of worship" atmosphere. Evangelism became the only way to do Christ's work in America, and so the young Alexander did the job. He became a famous lecturer and debater, and, in addition, modernized American evangelism with the use of the press. Through his journals The Christian Baptist and The Millennial Harbinger Alexander Campbell was able to evangelize for over forty years, his words reaching as far as the Pacific Coast. In addition, as founder and leader of Bethany College, the younger Campbell reached prominence in education. Eames refers to Alexander Campbell as "founder and leader of the largest Protestant group in the New World." I wonder if that is a true statement. Eames also says "His philosophy and religion has had a dynamic part in the shaping of the American mind."

Campbell, it seems, was interested in the "empirical method"; that is, observations, gained through man's sensory organs, should be used to substantiate traditional doctrines found in the Bible. The new discoveries in the linguistic and historical methods of scholarship should be applied to the Scriptures. Campbell sought to reconcile the new scientific views of the universe, and the older views of creation. How could the rising tide of democracy, as Eames puts it, be brought into a working harmony with ecclesiastical organizations? This was one of the problems that Alexander Campbell had to deal with when "reconciling."

Alexander Campbell felt that new experiences outgrow the old patterns of thought. He felt that one should conserve what is best and valuable in tradition, and search for the reasonable in novel developments.

Applying empirical study to the Bible, he found the notion of "covenant" important. He saw several stages in the development of the covenant: God with Adam; God with Abraham; God with Moses. Covenant implied dispensation and salvation of those men, and their people. Campbell felt that mankind as a whole became better (more evolved?) after each covenant. However,

the greatest covenant is found in the Acts of the Apostles, according to Alexander Campbell. Therefore, he looked upon the Old Testament with less interest than the New Testament. And Campbell's preachings became more Pauline than Christological. For Paul had said that the newest covenant was written in the hearts of men. Thus, Campbell felt simplistic Christianity should be united and all denominations harmonized under carefully scrutinized revelation that existed only in the Bible, and primarily in the New Testament's Acts of the Apostles. (Note: "simplistic theology" reminds me of Sidney Meade's model of civil religion, where the civil authority reflects those common elements held most profound by most denominations).

In regard to politics, Alexander Campbell felt that a man should act responsibly. Irresponsibility is equated with immorality. Man should act rationally and responsibly. The best form of government is the least form of government. Campbell felt that moral laws were revealed in the Bible and that was enough. He felt the necessity of a laissez-faire form of government, one that did not affect the individual's life nor coerce him from being primarily devoted to the Lord. This attitude is extremely supportive of and conducive to Sidney Meade's model of civil religion. That is, by hands-off policies, the civil authority takes on common characteristics of all denominations. If Campbell felt separation of church and state necessary, then how did he get involved in politics?

Campbell became involved with politics because he felt a man should be first educated in order to achieve salvation. That is, the man must be able to use his intellectual tools for Bible study and development of a rational faith. Campbell, subsequently, felt that it was the democracy's duty to educate all men, especially if that democracy was allowing them to vote. Further subsequent convictions arose--Campbell felt that women, as part of mankind, likewise had the right to salvation, thus the right to be educated, thus the right to vote in a democracy.

According to Dean E. Walker's Adventuring for Christian Unity, Campbell found a compromise between St. Paul's two basic themes consisting of liberty and order. Alexander Campbell felt that Paul was neither a complete libertarian nor a rigid institutionalist; but, rather, an acknowledger of man's dignity in freedom of choice, thought, and action, existing and reacting in a realm that necessitates a common-sense moral order.

I found that the Disciples of Christ, according to the followers of Campbell, have believed in the five following concepts, called the "five great truths":

1. The New Testament is the only embodiment of the norm for Christian faith and practice.
2. Everything is centered in the Lordship of Jesus Christ.
3. Evangelism must be simple and rational, and in doing find religious, emotional and rational synthesis--that is, 'to be a Christian is far more than to have an 'experience'."
4. Schism is a sin. "The sin of the Church has brought it into its present paralytic state."
5. The disorder in the Church is caused by a lack of unity in the "whole human personality."

The Disciples of Christ indeed had a different notion of covenant. That of one with Christ. In #3 the 'experience' refers to the effectual callings, I would assume, allegedly experienced during the Great Awakening. Obviously, Alexander Campbell felt the need to overhaul and rectify the vehicle of evangelism.

He undoubtedly saw America, as it is today, as a potpourri of denominations, 'schisms' as it were in Christ's kingdom on earth. He must have felt it blasphemous that many so-called "Christians" did not consider Christ as Saviour. His simple theology would lead to a unity of the split kingdom.

The beliefs of Alexander Campbell and his followers could have only gained credence and momentum in the United States. For "hands-off" separation of church and state is conducive to the Campbell ideal. If the Disciples of Christ had succeeded in unifying Christian churches, it could only have happened in America, where 'laissez-faire' and mass immigration allowed 'Christians' to easily flow from one denomination to another. The movement could never have gained any momentum in, for example, an England with its own church. Thus, America had the potential, as Campbell and his followers felt, to be the Christ's Kingdom on Earth. Had this occurred, the Christians' Church itself would have been the civil religion. Thus, Alexander Campbell and the Disciples must have become a serious challenge to the civil religion of civil authority.

I turned to A Compend of Alexander Campbell's Theology, edited by Royal Humbert, and found an interesting quirk in Alexander Campbell's personality. It seems that Campbell, who had demanded that all men should be educated, was "laissez-faire" himself concerning slavery, refusing to support either

the abolitionists or the slave-holders. Campbell felt that slavery was a political matter only. He saw in the Scriptures nothing that opposed slavery. I found this hard to believe because Campbell had rationalized that, according to the Bible, there had been both Christian slaves and Christian slave-holders. What about "Love thy neighbor as thyself," great-great-great Uncle? But, I assume, as Campbell recognized, that Southern Christians and Northern Christians often antagonized each other over the slavery issue. He must have been afraid of a further schism.

Because the Disciples did not act in the issue of slavery, Alexander Campbell and his followers apparently did nothing to quell a situation conducive to further schism. I feel, however, that the slavery issue caused the man to contradict his own ideal notion of Christianity: "...catholic in spirit...contemplates a great community, gathered out of every nation, kindred, tongue, and people."

What is the "great community" if it is to conquer a world filled with church-state structures? Applying the domino theory, America would have to become unified first; and, I believe, Campbell impeded himself and his movement by ignoring particular "political issues," that demanded a courageous moral judgment before compromise.

James De Forest Murch's Christians Only: A History of the Restoration Movement outlines Campbell's address to the Christian Association in 1810 which dealt with Campbell's own views on the proper nature of Christianity. Alexander Campbell felt that there should be no distinction between clergy and laity, because it is not authorized in the Scriptures. He felt each congregation should be separate with its own internal government, but with fellowship with each other congregation. All members must accept Christ as the Saviour. All must be baptized. All must follow Scripture. All must reject man-made principles and practices not institutionalized in the Scriptures.

Alexander Campbell disagreed with the Baptists on the point of sacraments, particularly the Lord's Supper. Thus, the separation; and the evangelist traveled extensively and challenged all established churches, gaining momentum for his movement. Alexander Campbell once said "Faith cometh by hearing the Word of God." Thus, the sign of the covenant was simplified. Exposure to Scripture was all one needed for potential salvation (allowing for eventual baptism, of course). Alexander Campbell rejected all moral, judicial, and ceremonial laws that were man-made.

Campbell left the Baptists because he preached the New Testament and equated himself and others with the Apostles at Pentecost, who were saved

and given the mission to preach to and convert all nations. He did not see this passage as advocating an ecclesiastical hierarchy. Alexander Campbell sought to destroy this notion of "religious infallibility of the ecclesiastical hierarchy." Current religion he felt, was a product of "extra-Scriptural ecclesiastical machinery."

Preaching to many different denominations and successfully challenging most of them, Campbell became known as the 'champion of true Christianity.' So popular he became, that, upon his return home, his friends and neighbors convinced him to be a candidate for election for the Virginia constitutional convention of 1829. He had become a large landowner and had distinguished himself in public affairs to such an extent that he was easily elected. His main interest in going to Richmond was to introduce legislation for the emancipation of slaves. Later he was to free his own slaves and he gave them money, food, and clothing that was more than substantial. However, upon his arrival at the convention, he found all the political power in the hands of the slave-owning aristocracy. Representation was heavily weighted in favor of the eastern counties. Campbell led an effort to gain more representation for the more southern and western counties, but was opposed by James Madison, James Monroe, John Marshall, and John Randolph--all landed aristocracy who desired an oligarchy in the state convention.

Campbell's eloquence achieved respect from his opponents. President Monroe felt Campbell "the ablest expounder of the Scriptures." He made friends among the political leaders of the country and, subsequently, became the only minister in the history of the republic to preach before the joint session of Congress.

Barton Stone's Christians and Campbell's Disciples joined and gained momentum in Kentucky. By 1847, 35,000 members in Kentucky constituted the state as the nation's leader in church-goers of any denomination. The Disciples of Christ, having the momentum in Kentucky, gained followers in: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Iowa, Texas, Nebraska, California, and Oregon. The conversions were attributed to Campbell's evangelism, and his journals that reached the far western states.

By the time the Civil War broke out, and during its duration, the Disciples of Christ, and followers of Stone-Campbell Christianity, became the strongest denomination, tolling each individual congregation. So, as the nation split, the Christians did not, and Campbell's Disciples of Christ became a type of civil religion (in Bellah's sense of motivation). For example, four Disciples of Christ broke a deadlock in a Kentucky delegation--sending the state to the ranks of the Union and not the South, believing they were adhering to the Scriptures.

However, I feel that for the most part the Disciples compromised in order to maintain their unity. Alexander Campbell, in 1829, had freed his slaves and introduced legislation for emancipation in Virginia. Rubbing elbows with politicians perhaps brought Campbell to consider black human beings a political matter. Thus, in this moral issue, the Disciples were non-committal.

Disciples fought on both sides of the Civil War. Kentucky for the North, and Alexander Campbell's own son for the South, for example. The Union and Confederate Disciples alike either believed that Christ and Scripture was on their particular side, or that a Civil War had no application in the Scriptures.

A new, larger covenant had grown under Campbell. Now the covenant remained, but the people in it were split. How could this paradox occur? Did the Disciples of Christ feed the fire of warfare on each side of the Civil War, or did the compromising, simplistic nature of Alexander Campbell's teachings adamantly demanding the separation of church and state make religion take a backseat to diametrically opposed civil authorities (i.e., North versus South)?

Conclusion

Indeed, Alexander Campbell unified a Christian church all over America which withstood the Civil War better than any other church. Thus, unity was achieved. However, if Scripture had been strictly followed, as Campbell demanded, why did Americans not 'turn the other cheek,' nor 'love thy neighbor' by freeing slaves, nor achieve, in general, Christ's Kingdom on Earth.

Indeed, Alexander Campbell developed a simple theology conducive to covenanting mass numbers of people. But did he covenant their hearts, as Paul suggested? Had the Campbell ideal occurred with the same vigor as the success of getting people to come to several Disciple-Christian churches, then, indeed, these majority of Americans would have put Christ, the Lord and Saviour, above all and any civil authority. The question is: did this happen? I personally think not. I see a paradox: the Disciples of Christ, Campbellites, were strong in number; but it did not motivate them to the extent of civil authority.

The independent nature of each congregation was conducive to widespread unity on the surface. But did it succeed in the motivational force generating action during the temporal lives of each member? I think not, for the actions, in the light of the Civil War, were unified under the opposing civil authorities. Thus, the covenant of one people under Christ was not achieved. That is,

those covenanted with Christ fought against those they were united with under Christ. And so Alexander Campbell's ideal--devotion to the Lord above all things--was not, I feel, realized.

If I were to write a research document about Alexander Campbell, I would deal with this paradox primarily. My title for the paper would be:

Alexander Campbell: The Greatest Evangelist for the American Covenant;
or the Biggest Failure?

Maurice Wiles, The Christian Fathers (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966).

John R. Willis (ed.), The Teachings of the Church Fathers (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966)

II HISTORIES OF DOGMA AND DOCTRINE

Jean Daniélou, Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée 1: Théologie du judéo-christianisme; 2: Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles (Tournai: Desclee, 1958, 1961).

J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (2nd ed.; London: A. & C. Black, 1960).

Michael Schmaus and Alois Grillmeier (eds.), Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte:

1/4: Johannes Beumer, Die mündliche Überlieferung als Glaubensquelle (Freiburg: Herder, 1962).

2/2a: Leo Scheffczyk, Schopfung und Vorsehung (Freiburg: Herder, 1963)

4/2: Burkhard Neunheuser, Taufe und Firmung (Freiburg: Herder, 1956).

4/3: Bernhard Poschmann, Busse und Letzte Ölung (Freiburg: Herder, 1951).

4/4b: Burkhard Neunheuser, Eucharistie in Mittelalter und Neuzeit (Freiburg: Herder, 1963).

The Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte is being presented in English under the series title "The Herder History of Dogma," published by Herder and Herder. Titles thus far in print are:

Burkhard Neunheuser, Baptism and Confirmation (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964).

Bernhard Poschmann, Penance and the Anointing of the Sick (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964).

III HISTORIES OF PHILOSOPHY

Frederick Copleston, Medieval Philosophy: Augustine to Scotus (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1950).

Guillermo Fraile, Historia de la filosofía 2 (Madrid: Editorial Catolica, 1959).

Bernhard Geyer, Die patristische und scholastische Philosophie (12th ed.; Basel: Schwabe, 1951).

Etienne Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages (New York: Random House, 1955).

Othmar Perler, Patristische Philosophie (Bibliographische Einführungen in das Studium der Philosophie 18; Bern: Francke, 1950).

55) Harry Austryn Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers 1: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1956).

IV EDITIONS

Jacques-Paul Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina (221 vols.; Paris, 1844-55).

Jacques-Paul Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca (161 vols.; Paris, 1857-66).

Adalbert Hamman, Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina, Supplementum 1, 2, 3, and 4/1-2 (Paris: Garnier, 1958-).

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum (Vienna, 1866-).

Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (Berlin, 1897-).

Corpus christianorum: Series latina (Brepols: Turnhout, 1953-).

Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium (Louvain, 1903-).

Sources chrétiennes, ed. C. Mondésert (Paris: Cerf, 1942-).

V TRANSLATIONS

Edward Bouverie Pusey, John Keble, and John Henry Newman (eds.), A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of the East and West (45 vols.; Oxford, 1838-88).

Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325 (24 vols.; Edinburgh, 1866-72); additional volume, ed. Allan Menzies, Edinburgh, 1896). Cf. American reprint of this Edinburgh editions, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, revised by A. Cleveland Coxe (8 vols.; Buffalo, 1884-86), with two original supplements (Vol. 9 by Menzies; Vol. 10 by Coxe).

Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (28) vols.; Buffalo and New York, 1886-1900; reprinting, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1952-56).

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge [SPCK], Translations of Christian Literature (London, 1899-).

John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen (eds.), Library of Christian Classics (London and Philadelphia, 1953-).

Johannes Quasten, Walter J. Burghardt, and Thomas Comerford Lawler, (eds.), Ancient Christian Writers (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1946-).

Roy J. Deferrari et al. (eds.), The Fathers of the Church (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1947-).

Claude Mondésert (ed.), Sources chrétiennes (Paris: Cerf, 1942-).

VI ENCYCLOPEDIAS AND DICTIONARIES

Cf. standard encyclopedias: DTC, DAFC, DHGE, DACL, DSAM, DDC, EC, NCE, LTK, RGG.

F. L. Cross (ed.), The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957).

Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, ed. Theodor Klauser (Stuttgart: Heirsemann, 1950-).

William Smith and Henry Wace (eds.), Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines (4 vols.; 4 vols.; London, 1877-87).

Lefferts A. Loetscher (ed.), Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1955).

VII LEXICONS

Walter Bauer, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (5th ed.; Berlin: Topelmann, 1958). English translation and adaptation of the fourth edition (1952): A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1957).

Albert Blaise, Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens (Strasbourg: "Le Latin Chretien," 1954).

J. F. Niermeyer, Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus (Leiden: Brill, 1954-).

G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961-).

Thesaurus linguae latinae (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904-).

VIII PERIODICALS AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AIDS

Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum (Munster, Aschendorff, 1958-).

Vigiliae christianae (Amsterdam, 1947-).

Bibliographia patristica, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1950-).

Walter J. Burghardt, "Patristic Studies," in Elmer O'Brien (ed.), Theology in Transition: A Bibliographical Evaluation of the "Decisive Decade," 1954-1964 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965) pp. 120-73.

Section I

- ③ The effect of the Bar Kochbar Revolution on Jewish/Christian relations was that the Christians came to resent the Jews for causing so much trouble.

The Bustillos No. 3

RS. 320 B

To the Romans the Christians were just another Jewish sect and so they were treated as such. The non-Jewish Christians ~~the~~ couldn't understand why they were be punish for the misdeeds of the Jewish community. Before, because of the 66-70 AD war the Jews hated the Christians for being "Traitors," but now the Christians hated the Jews for causing so much trouble.

The Marcion Controversy grew out of this situation.

Section II

- D. Diaspora Judaism was made ~~up~~ up of those practicing Jews "scattered" throughout the Roman world. They were different from their Palestinian ~~cont.~~ counterpart parts because they were basically Urbanites. They were heavily involved in the garment ~~business~~ business. They spoke Koine Greek + ~~Hebrew~~ for commercial purposes (i.e. avoiding excessive taxing) ran their trading & businesses on a "word-of-mouth" ~~trust~~ system.

Politically they were separatists, that is, they were not involved in the secular civic life. That does not mean that they did not have a social life. Their social as well as religious life centered around the Synagogue.

Diaspora Judaism contributed the initial form of the Christian community organization (cf. 1 Cor. 14th). More importantly they contributed the LXX translation, making scripture accessible to the Roman world. The New Testament writings were produced outside of Palestine.

The method of making converts was another contribution.

- 3) With the knowledge that we now possess about 1st century Judaism many scholars feel comfortable to ~~the~~ say that Jesus of Nazareth was a Pharisaical rabbi.

They base their theory on the following statement

- a) Jesus believed in the Resurrection of the just & the unjust (cf. Matt 22 & 25): a view not held by the Sadducees
- b) Jesus believed in the existence of Angels & Demons: another view not held by the Sadducees.

①

Ed
H. Ryan

- c) Jesus believed in both Free Will + Predestination: the essence believed in Predestination alone while the Sadducees believed in Free Will alone.
- d) Jesus held that $\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha$ did not consist of just the Pentateuch but all the Law + the Prophets.
- e) + finally that Jesus' method of argumentation was Rabbinically Pharisaical

Section III

- 1. The Four Gospels are trustworthy documents because they were written by Jesus' contemporaries (or immediate disciples & the Apostles) based on the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta'\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ or the Q-document.
Another element that adds to the historicity of the Gospels is the ancient art of Oral Tradition. To the ancients Oral Tradition was as accurate as a modern tape recording.

Section IV

- 1. Marcion was the son of the Bishop of Sinope in Pontus. He was a wealthy shipowner. When ~~the~~ Christians began to be thrown into prison along with the Jews in the Bar Kochba Revolt, Marcion felt that it'd be better for business that he let the courts know that he was not a Jew. He set out to prove the Christianity was not a Jewish sect. In the process denuded the LXX or much of the N.T.
He forced the church to decide what is $\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha$. And who Jesus is.

Excellent
25

~~Mr. Ryan~~

2/10/19
10/10/19

- sec. I
- ① Historical founder - in space + time
 - ② roots - tradition - in space + time
 - ③ Adversus - High Priesthood - Factions
 - ④ over handling Hellanizer - Hellenism - pious fund
 - ① Pharisees - separate
 - ② Essenes - devout
 - ③ Sadducees - compromise
 - ⑤ oppression - Apocalyptic lit.
 - ⑥ Patriarchal situation - compromise - poor view
 - ⑦ legal religion - Jews fought - Xristian ran
 - ⑧ All over world Jews make demands, cause troubles - Xristian punished w/ Jews

sec. II.

- ① Urban - garment, LXX, synagogue center
archisynagogos - prayer leader
action + council of elders - internal civic affairs
proselytism ① full convert - circum. law
② God-fearer = οἱ φοβούμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ
initial form of Xristian community organization
- ② Patriarchism: Fert cult
7 stages - Raven, Nymph, Soldier, Lion, Persian, Sun-bearer, Father
- ③ Pharisean ④ Persecution ⑤ angels ⑥ trials, Persecution
- ④ method of argumentation - parables etc.

sec. II

① Historical

Q.W. writing
Freedom - life of Q.W. - contemporary
Patriarchism - "

new element: Old Tradition ancient world
Q-document

Kerygma - hymns - Passion Narration
apocalyptic

Q.W. is 1st pres. - all involve presuppositions

②

sec. III

- ① Markinos - son of bishop of Sinope in Pontus (Black Sea) wealthy ship owner
ex-com by Dad - Rome 140 ex in Rome 144 by 160 AD own church in
Rome emp. Antithesis (warrior)

Acceptance

60 of Council of	Nicea	360
"	Nicea	325
"	Hippo	393
"	Carthage	397 - Ar
"	Hippo	419
Quincentive Council (Trullo II)		692
doubt of		
Council of Florence		1441
"	Trent	1546

↑

- ① Apostolic Origin
- ② Community addressed
- ③ Rule of Faith - Doctrine expressed in writing
- ④ Rule of usage - continuous

- γρηγοριαν - 3 level
- ① λογικὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
 - ② κρυπτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου
 - ③ γρηγοριαν

Q.W. is 1st pres. - all involve presuppositions

RS 320: History of Christianity

Study Questions for the MIDTERM examination

Directions: No essay may be longer than 400 words. Judgment of the essay will be based on three criteria: (1) correctness of data, (2) clarity of expression, (3) coherence of argument.

Section I: (5 points): Chronological Survey of New Testament Times
One of the eight questions to which you have already submitted written replies will be on the Midterm.

Section II: (10 points): Expansion of Christianity
Answer N^o 1 and either N^o 2 or N^o 3

1. Using your geographic outline of the Acts of the Apostles show what the Judaism of the diaspora but within the Roman Empire was. What permanent contributions did diaspora Judaism make to Christianity? (NB, You must answer this question.)
2. Explain what a mystery religion is and show why Mithraism is important to the rise of Christianity. What strengths and weaknesses contributed to the rise and fall of Mithraism?
3. Show that Jesus of Nazareth was a Pharisee.

Section III: (5 points): Historicity of the Gospels
Answer either N^o 1 or N^o 2

1. Show why the four Gospels are historically trustworthy documents concerning the life of Jesus.
2. Answer the following objection: The New Testament gives us only information about the Christ of Faith and can tell us nothing about the Jesus of History.

Section IV: (5 points): Canon of Sacred Scripture
Answer either N^o 1 or N^o 2

1. Who was Marcion and why is he important for the History of Christianity?
2. What criteria determined which Christian writings would be γραφαί (= graphai (Scripture on a par with the Septuagint))?

H. J. Ryan

GEOGRAPHIC OUTLINE of ACTS

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>REFERENCE</u>
I. <u>JERUSALEM</u>	1:1-7:60
II. <u>COUNTRYSIDE OF JUDEA & SAMARIA</u>	8:1-9:30
A. SAMARITAN TOWN- PHILLIP.....	(8:1-25)
B. ETHIOPIAN ON ROAD TO GAZA- PHILLIP....	(8:26-39)
C. AZOTUS - PHILLIP.....	(8:39-40)
D. DAMASCUS- SAUL.....	(9:1-29)
E. CAESAREA & TARSUS- SAUL.....	(9:30)
III. <u>THROUGHOUT ALL JUDEA, GALILEE, & SAMARIA</u>	9:31-12:25
A. LYDDA & SHARON- PETER.....	(9:32-35)
B. JOPPA- PETER.....	(9:36-43)
C. CAESAREA- PETER.....	(10:1-48)
D. ANTIOCH.....	(11:19-30)
IV. <u>THE JOURNEYS OF PAUL</u>	13:1-28:30
A. 1st MISSIONERY JOURNEY.....	(13:1-14:28)
1. Cyprus(13:4-12)	
2. Perga in Pamphylia(13:13)	
3. Antioch in Pisidia(13:14-50)	
4. Iconium(13:51-14:5)	
5. Lystra & Derbe of Lycaonian(14:6-21)	
6. Attalia(14:25)	
B. COUNCIL of JERUSALEM.....	(15:1-35)
C. 2nd MISSIONERY JOURNEY.....	(15:36-18:22)
1. Derbe & Lystra(16:1-5)	
2. Phrygia & Galatian territory(16:6)	
3. Mysia(16:7)	
4. Troas(16:8-10)	
5. Samothrace & Neapolis(16:11)	
6. Philippi(16:12-40)	
7. Thessalonica(17:1-9)	
8. Beroea(17:10-15)	
9. Athens(17:16-34)	
10. Corinth(18:1-17)	
11. Ephesus(18:18-21)	
12. Caesarea & Antioch(18:22)	
D. 3rd MISSIONERY JOURNEY.....	(18:23-21:14)
1. Galatian Country & Phrygia(18:23-28)	
2. Ephesus(19:1-20:1)	
3. Macedonia(20:2-5)	
4. Troas(20:6-12)	
5. Miletus(20:13-38)	
6. Cos, Rhodes, & Patara(21:1)	
7. Tyre(21:2-6)	
8. Ptolemais(21:7)	
9. Caesarea(21:8-14)	

(cont.)

IV. THE JOURNEYS OF PAUL(CONT)

- E. JERUSALEM.....(21:15-23:30)
- F. IN PRISON IN CAESAREA.....(23:31-26:32)
- G. DEPARTURE TO ROME.....(26:33-28:31)
 - 1. Adramyttium(27:1-2)
 - 2. Sidon(27:3)
 - 3. Cyprus(27:4)
 - 4. Myra in Lycia(27:5-6)
 - 5. Cuidus, Salmone(27:7)
 - 6. Fair Haven(27:8)
 - 7. Shipwreck(27:9-44)
 - 8. Malta(28:1-10)
 - 9. Syracruse(28:11-12)
 - 10. Rhegium, Puteoli(28:13-14)
 - 11. Forum of Appius, Three Taverns, & Rome(28:15-31)



IV. DEVELOPMENT OF TRINITARIAN AND CHRISTOLOGICAL DOGMA

Introduction:

This theme tries to answer the question, "Who is Jesus Christ?" We have, in theme I, given an answer to this question. On the level of historical narrative one answers that Jesus was a Pharisee, founded an ^{Jesus club} habburah, etc., etc. In theme I we also answered the question on the level of contemporary value judgments concerning Jesus of Nazareth. These value judgments constitute the literal sense of Scripture, that is, these value judgments are what the final redactors of the New Testament books wish to communicate to their readers. The answer given on these two levels can be a detached, objective almost archeological exercise in the history of ideas. Theme IV, however, is different.

Theme IV starts the history of theological reflection in answer to the question, "Who is Jesus?" This reflection, which begins in the post-apostolic age, wrestles not with the religious and legal tradition of Israelite religion but with the rational tradition of the Hellenistic world - which by far was and is the overwhelming world-view of humankind. The issue, then as now, centers on revelation. The religious and legal tradition of Israel depends on revelation: The rational tradition of the Hellenistic world denied even the possibility of revelation.
issue centers on Revelation

read up to book 256 in Chadwick

A. Significance

1. The intellectual debate occasioned by the effort to understand who Jesus is and what he means resulted in the:

- i. overthrow of the Hellenistic civilization of the Roman Empire;
- Emperor worship - Xian couldn't accept it.
- ii. creation of the distinctive culture of the Western World.
- Xian view of man etc. effects, creates

- Problem 2. Today Western civilization, which is a product of Christianity, is in crisis

- i. intellectually *closed universe*
post-Kantian metaphysical skepticism has resulted in a world-view (growing in the West) which is akin to Hellenism. In Kant's view man cannot intellectually know the Noumenon (ding an sich). God, Jesus Christ, or any individual is actually a Noumenon. Therefore, they cannot be known intellectually. Man grasps only the phenomenon. Some post-Kantians maintain that if the Noumenon is unknowable, there are consequently no intellectual grounds to affirm existence or reality of the Noumenon. Moreover, we only know part of the phenomenon, i. e., our language which symbolically points to the phenomenon. The task of philosophy is limited to understanding the rules of language. To ask questions concerning

There isn't no one out there doing nothing, no way

*Ethics - can you know!
morality - question of duty not love*

*conscious - can't know "self"
necessity of unconscious*

meaning or value is actually to ask about the Noumenon or that part of the phenomenon which transcends our language-symbol system. Such questions ask about the unknowable. These questions make no sense at all. *No values*

ii. morally

With such a view of the intellectual task, it follows that questions of good and evil, right and wrong - all value questions - are ultimately unanswerable because they are without meaning. Ethics and morality become a search to find an empirical norm (similar to the laws of language) to have people "live" together.

*valueless society:
- not right or wrong
but does it work?*

iii.

politically

grammar - morality
was not interested in the morality of X but the legality.
Given this skepticism, human beings may construct whatever form of social living meets their social needs (do one's own thing alone or with others). The only criterion for judging one system of social living over against another is the empirical result of the two systems.

iv. historically

Granted this view, history has no meaning. It is merely collective experience while humankind awaits the collapse of our solar system.

3. A result of this intellectual, moral, political and historical skepticism is a deep-seated prejudice against the possibility of revelation which reduces the development of the Trinitarian and Christological dogmas to an irrelevant value scheme of some archeological interest. However the values asserted in these dogmas seem preposterous, naive, passe' - an exercise in romantic arrogant authoritarianism.

*General pattern - phenomenon can't know the
Noumenon*

4. What are the values that are asserted?

Revelation

Non-Revelation

i. Reality is:

physical
individual
diverse

spiritual
abstract - general
one

ii. Human beings are:

real "persons"
individual
free and responsible

illusions - shadows (uncentered)
really not different from one another
trapped by inevitable fate

*Gov't: not out to
teach morality but to
ensure that there is
as little damage to
system (even the sinners).*

Revelation

- iii. Time is:
linear
- iv. History is:
God working with
man for a purpose
- v. God is:
Personal and concerned

maturity

Non-Revelation

cyclic

meaningless ultimately - the
external world is not really real:
differences in the external world
are equally unreal - collective
experience is worthless

may be what is but even that is
unknowable

*add - facing the meaninglessness
of ~~the~~ existence w/
courage.*

IV. Christological + Trinitarian Dogma: Councils

A. The General Problem: How approach the development of Christological + Trinitarian dogma within the framework of monotheism inherited from Judaism? Did Jesus explicitly + clearly affirm that he was the second person of the Blessed Trinity? If he did not, what foundation is there to the Christian Church's dogma concerning his unique relationship to the triune God? If the early Councils (Nicaea, Constantinople I, Ephesus and Chalcedon) "reaffirm" the data of Scripture, is there continuity between Jesus' self-evaluation of himself and the evaluation of him made by the New Testament writers?

B. The New Testament Data:

1. Twentieth Century Views on the Christology of the New Testament
(cf. the separate sheet distributed)

- a) Liberalism: no real relation between NT Christology and Jesus' self-evaluation. NT Christology is a mistaken evaluation of Jesus, a distortion of the simple teacher from Galilee. Jesus' divinity was invented by the NT writers to give emphasis to Jesus' moral demands.
- b) Bultmannian Existentialism: NT gives us only Christ of faith. We can never know Jesus of history. Therefore we cannot know Jesus' self-evaluation of himself. However, the Church continues Jesus' challenge to accept the belief that God acts in history. "Jesus preached the Kingdom and the Church preaches Jesus". Functionally the preaching is the same, has the same religious

IV B
b) cont.

result since one may believe that God does something for mankind.

c) Conservationism: Some real relation between Jesus' self-evaluation of himself during his public ministry and the evaluation of him made by the NT writers.

i) non scholarly approach: no development from Jesus' own self-evaluation to that portrayed in the NT. Either pictographic (mirror or kinescope) unhistorical use of the NT writings or magisterial fundamentalism (abstract, non-developmental, unhistorical, philosophic treatment of authoritative church documents dealing with unchanging "truth"). This approach is not in keeping with Roman Catholic teaching. (Cf. 1943 Divino afflante Spiritu of Pius XII, 1964 Pontifical Biblical Commission, 1965 Dei Verbum - On Divine Revelation - Chapter 5, of Vatican Council II.) However, this approach is actually taken by the vast majority of Roman Catholics throughout the world at the present time.

ii) scholarly approach: Through study of the NT we may reach the historical Jesus, not just the Christ of faith.

a) Explicit Christology (Cullmann, Jeremias, Dodd, Taylor, most Roman Catholic scholars of the 1960's). Jesus accepted and used the "lower titles" e.g. Messiah, Prophet, Servant of God, Son of Man. Jesus did not accept and did not use the "higher titles", Lord (Κυριος), God (Θεός - Yahuweh), Son of God (Υιός Θεού).

b) Implicit Christology (Hahn, Fuller, Levin, Raymond Brown and many Roman Catholic exegetes & theologians of the 1970's, myself included). Jesus did not accept or use "lower" or "higher" titles. No "lower" title that Jesus is reputed to have used or accepted would adequately describe who Jesus knew he was. In the context of Judaic monotheism Jesus uses parables and healings to reveal who he is. Only after the resurrection did his disciples clearly perceive Jesus' divinity and understand what Jesus said & did.

∴ Historically one can show that Jesus clearly but implicitly affirmed a self-evaluation in real continuity with that made of him in the NT writings.

H. J. Ryan, S.J.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY VIEWS ON THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

88

(A survey of opinions on the relationship between the evaluation of Jesus during his ministry and the christological evaluation of him in the NT writings composed some twenty to one hundred years later.)

Non-Scholarly Liberalism	Views Within The Domain Of Scholarship			Non-Scholarly Conservatism		
	Scholarly Liberalism	Bultmannian Existentialism	Scholarly Conservatism			
<p>This view regards the christological question as unimportant, for Christianity is primarily concerned with how man should live. Jesus came to teach man a way of life centered on love. It was his followers who first gave any importance to evaluating him.</p> <p>Liberalism was popular in the Protestantism of the late 1800's and early 1900's. It has revived today in Catholicism as a reaction to the dogmatic strictness of the past.</p>	<p>(Early 1900's)</p> <p>Liberal scholars developed a scientific methodology for detecting precise stages of growth in NT christology. They judged this growth to be a creation, distorting the historical Jesus. Christology was once necessary in order to preserve the memory of Jesus, but now modern scholarship can give us the historical Jesus without christology which should be dispensed with.</p> <p>Exemplified in W. Bousset's <i>Kyrios Christos</i> (1913).</p>	<p>(1920's through the 1950's)</p> <p>A reaction to liberalism. He further refined the scientific methodology, but rejected the liberal judgment on the invalidity of christology. Bultmann is indefinite and even agnostic on how Jesus evaluated himself. But the NT christology is functionally equivalent to Jesus' message about the kingdom, since both are a demand to accept what God has done through Jesus. Christology cannot be dispensed with.</p>	<p>(1960's and 1970's)</p> <p>Most scholars today are less agnostic than Bultmann about the historical Jesus and admit a continuity between the evaluation of Jesus during the ministry and the evaluation of him in the NT. Yet they continue to use with refinement the methodology for detecting growth in NT christology. The dominating motif is development in continuity. A division exists as to whether to posit an explicit christology in the ministry of Jesus (he used or accepted some titles: Son of Man, Suffering Servant, Messiah) or an implicit christology (Jesus did not use or accept christological titles).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Implicit Christology</p> <p>Scholars such as Hahn, Fuller, Perrin; some post-Bultmannians; many Catholics of the 1970's.</p> </td> <td> <p>Explicit Christology</p> <p>Scholars such as Cullmann, Jeremias, Dodd, Taylor; most Catholics of the 1960's.</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p>Implicit Christology</p> <p>Scholars such as Hahn, Fuller, Perrin; some post-Bultmannians; many Catholics of the 1970's.</p>	<p>Explicit Christology</p> <p>Scholars such as Cullmann, Jeremias, Dodd, Taylor; most Catholics of the 1960's.</p>
<p>Implicit Christology</p> <p>Scholars such as Hahn, Fuller, Perrin; some post-Bultmannians; many Catholics of the 1970's.</p>	<p>Explicit Christology</p> <p>Scholars such as Cullmann, Jeremias, Dodd, Taylor; most Catholics of the 1960's.</p>					
			<p>A failure to allow any development from the ministry to the NT. This theory posits that Jesus was christologically evaluated during his ministry exactly as he is portrayed in the Gospels (which are literal accounts of the ministry).</p> <p>A view held defensively by fundamentalist Protestants. Also held by Catholics until Church changes in the approach to the Bible began to affect Gospel study in the 1960's.</p>			

Jesus (His pub. life)

Jesus' self-evaluation of himself:
Jesus' religious experience = Revelation

What Jesus consciously did:

Founded a New Covenant (berit)
by offering a hattat (sacrifice
of expiation)

But: only Yahweh could

- 1) found or establish a Covenant
- 2) offer a perfect hattat

∴ Jesus evaluated himself as
being on the same level of
existence as Yahweh

NT authors' value judgments
about Jesus are expressed
in the titles they predicate
of Jesus

Note: None of the titles
actually exhaust the
full mystery of Jesus'
self-understanding.

None of the titles
clearly & distinctly affirms
how Jesus is both God
and man and how Jesus
and Yahweh are one and
yet distinct

Creeds agree with
the NT value judgments
about Jesus. Yet
the Creeds sense there
is a deeper mystery
about Jesus than even
the NT titles tell.

Thus the Creeds:

- 1) Confess the titles &
- 2) recite what Jesus
did

H. J. Ryan, H

IV Development of Trinitarian + Christological Dogma: Councils

- A. The General Problem: (How did Christian Trinitarianism come from Jewish monotheism?)
- B. The New Testament Data: (Christianity as an historical religion claims to know what God is like + man is)
1. Twentieth Century View on the Christology of the New Testament
 2. Textual Considerations
- C. Problems (Does SS accurately reflect what Jesus said + did? Do the Councils correspond to SS?)
1. Jesus Christ:
 - a) historical or classical problematic (unity of Christ)
 - b) modern or contemporary problematic (psychological unity of Christ)
 2. Trinity:
 - a) historical or classical problematic (emergence of Trinitarianism from monotheism)
 - b) modern or contemporary problematic (verification of "God talk")
- D. Controversies and Councils:
1. Docetism: (δοκέω = I seem) God is good + all holy; matter is evil. Therefore Jesus Christ only seemed to have a material body. God could not have become incarnate (enfleshed in evil = matter)
 2. Gnosticism: (γνῶσις = knowledge) Jesus revealed a knowledge to a spiritual elite. The material world is evil and the creation of the demiurge. Jesus gave a knowledge about a higher God and this knowledge freed the spiritual component of man. Jesus only temporarily inhabited a human body. He was the *Logos* using a human body. Jesus did not have a human intellect or human will for both these elements are centers of deceit and moral evil. Jesus was not born and did not die, as both these events would place him in the power of the demiurge who rules the realm of matter. Cf. Beetonson pp. 35-37 for the four types (Syrian, Egyptian, Judaizing, Pontic [Marcion]).
 3. Monarchianism: (μονός = one, ἑρμῆς = principle)
 - a) Logos Monism: condemned circa 250 for asserting the Son is the Father. To describe the relationship of Son to Father, Paul used the term ὁμοουσιος (homoousios). In 325 the Council of Nicaea used the same word ὁμοουσιος to answer Arius. But the Council used the term ὁμοουσιος in the sense of "consubstantial" to stress that the Son is NOT a creature and is God and equal to the Father. The use of the term ὁμοουσιος caused great pastoral confusion
 - b) Subordination of Logos: condemned for asserting that the Father, Son + Holy Spirit are one and the same being. Each is only a *πρόσωπον* (a mask), a manifestation of one and the same being. Πρόσωπον thus became a tainted word and the Council of Chalcedon will not use it to describe the three "persons" in God. Instead, in order to avoid pastoral confusion it will use the word ὁμοουσιος, not in the sense of substance but in the sense of "the likeness of something"

IV B. The New Testament Data:

2. Textual Considerations: Though the "higher" and "lower" titles are an index of the way the Church confessed its understanding of who Jesus meant for men, to grasp Jesus' self-evaluation of himself one would have to analyze the descriptions of Jesus' actions and miracles; his attitude toward the Temple, the Sabbath, and judgment; his self-assurance in his proclamations and teaching; his kindness. However to exemplify the problem let us examine those NT texts which seem to state that Jesus is God (Deos)

a) Texts that seem to imply that the title God (Deos) was not used for Jesus

Mk 10, 18: Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone.

Mk 15, 34; Mt 27, 46: My God, My God why have you forsaken me?

Jn 20, 17: I am ascending to my Father & your Father, to my God & your God

Eph 1, 17: The Lord of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory

Several passages that distinguish between the one God and Jesus Christ

Jn 17, 3; 1 Cor 8, 6; Eph 4, 4-6; 1 Cor 12, 4-6; 2 Cor 13, 14; 1 Tim 2, 5.

Some texts seem to state that Jesus is less than God or the Father

Jn 14, 28 The Father is greater than I

Mk 13, 32 Of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father

Phil 2, 5-10 Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form (μορφή) of God, did not count being equal with God a thing to be clung to, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant... Therefore God has exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name... that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father

This is the famous kenosis hymn. Jesus by the kenosis (emptying) moves from a stage where he is in the form of God and equal to God to a stage where he takes the form of a servant to effect mankind's salvation. This done, he is exalted, but note, the name bestowed on Jesus at the exaltation is not Deos (God) but Kyrios (Lord). Deos (God) who exalts Jesus and bestows the name Kyrios on Jesus is God the Father

1 Cor 15, 24

1 Cor 15, 28 Then the Son himself will also be subjected to Him who put all things under Him, that God may be everything to everyone.

These five texts will become the stock in trade of the Oriental

b) Texts where the use of God (Deos) for Jesus is dubious sexually or from pagan

Gal 2, 20; Acts 20, 28; Jn 1, 18 (dubious textual transmission with 1755 variant)

Col 2, 2; 2 Th 1, 12; Tit 2, 13; 1 Jo 5, 20; Rom 9, 5 (problem, but only time God with Jesus Deos), 2 Cor 1, 1.

c) Texts where Jesus is clearly called Deus (God)

- Heb 1, 8-9 applies to Jesus the words of Psalm 45, 6-7 cited according to the Septuagint
 Jn 1, 1 background in the opening of Gospel in Septuagint translation (OT verse of Wisdom, Wisdom)
 Jn 20, 28 seems to apply Psalm 35, 23 "My Lord & my Lord" to Jesus. Note also that Thomas' confession of the risen Jesus recalls the Emperor Domitian's claim & title dominus et deus nostrorum. Thomas' confession is certainly intended as the climax of John's Gospel and for others who have not seen to believe

Conclusion: It would appear that calling Jesus Deus arises from concepts of Christianity from Diaspora Judaism
 In each clear case the NT text seems to reflect a liturgical hymn drawn from Psalms or laden with OT imagery (cf. Philip's description of Jesus)
 In the case of Thomas' confession we are dealing with a literary form that casts Thomas as a type - not with an historical recording of what Thomas actually said. If Thomas actually did call Jesus Deus one week after the resurrection it is inexplicable that the title is used only 3 times clearly in the NT and in writings from only the late 80's or 90's.

Importance: Christianity, unlike the other major world religions, is an historical religion that maintains that its founder, Jesus of Nazareth was both God and man. Religiously the New Testament, the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople I, Ephesus and Chalcedon deal with the love of God for man. If Jesus is not God, then we do not know God in human terms. All he did was tell us at second hand about a God who really remains as distant as the farthest stars of Aristotle. Only if Jesus is God do we know that God's love for us is so real that he gave himself for us. Only if Jesus is God do we know what God is like, for in Jesus we see God translated into terms that we can understand and respond to personally. Unless we understand that Jesus was truly human, we cannot begin to comprehend the meaning of God's love or the meaning and value of human life and experience.
 Jesus was truly human. He subjected himself to the most agonizing infirmities. The future for him was as much a mystery, a dread, and a hope as it is for us. He truly went through life's real trials, yet he did so with a consciousness of what it meant to love God as his Father. He grew in the human consciousness of who he was and the pattern of Jesus' consciousness for set the goals of full human development and growth. As fully human Jesus showed us what it is to be fully human - both in this life and that to come.

H. J. Lyons D. J.

IV Development of Trinitarian + Christological Dogma: Concepts

Problem Area #1: Jesus Christ { how does one go from SS to historical Christ? (back)
 { how does one go from SS to Creed? (forward)

a) historical or classical problematic (unity of Christ)

"Jesus Christ is true God and true man"

(true God: divine $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$)



human $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$: true man)



complete "human being", fully conscious, true human body: "like us in all things, sin alone excepted"

hypostatic union ($\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ = $\dot{\upsilon}\mu\omega\tau\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigma$)

b) modern or contemporary problematic (psychological unity of Christ)

How did Jesus know he was God?

cf. St Thomas, Summa Theologica III, q. 9, art. 9, ad 1

Problem Area #2: Trinity { how can 1 be 3 and 3, 1? (relative is not counted like absolute)
 { Is the Trinity a contradiction in terms? (cannot be shown to be so in "uncreated" being)

a) historical or classical problematic (emergence of Trinitarianism from monotheism)

Judaism

Christianity

Paganism

Monotheism

Trinitarianism

Tritheism

1 God = YHWH

1 God: 3 divine "persons"

3 gods

Father = YHWH

Son = Jesus

Spirit = Gift

3 ὁμοούσιος (rational subject of attribution in one uncreated being as "one and")

b) modern or contemporary problematic (recapitulation of "God talk")

i) What is an $\dot{\upsilon}\mu\omega\tau\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigma$? Not "person" in the English sense of person. Moreover, the "persons" of the Blessed Trinity are not "persons" as we are "persons". They are uncreated

ii) How can the $\alpha\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ only become incarnate and the other two "persons" not become incarnate also?

H.J. Ripstein

4. Councils: The problem which the early Councils faced was how to express an understanding of Scripture in terms of a "God talk" intelligible to human reason.

a) Nicaea: 325 A.D. condemns Arius of Alexandria; affirms the Son is true God of true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father ($\text{ὁμοουσιον τῷ Πατρί}$) cf. Bettenson, p. 25

i) Arius held (cf. Bettenson, pp. 25, 39-41)

Unbegotten \leftrightarrow Begotten ἢν ἦτοε οὐκ ἦν (It eternally there was a moment when the Son was not)
 Father \leftrightarrow Son

Creator \rightarrow Causing \leftrightarrow Caused \rightarrow Creature (made from nothing ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων)
 In existence \longrightarrow Has existence become begin to be

\therefore If the Son is begotten, the Son is caused and the Son differs from the Father as a creature differs from the Creator

ii) Religious importance: If the Son is only a creature, we do not know what God the Creator is like in himself.

iii) Critique: Arius' errors were to assume that (1) unbegotten and begotten were the basic Scriptural categories of the New Testament to tell us about God. (2) the Son's proceeding from the Father (ἐκ πατρὸς , cf. John 8, 42) was like the human generative process and an instance of Causality in which a Father causes a son to exist or come into existence. Against Arius, St. Athanasius insisted that (1) Father & Son were the basic Scriptural categories used by Jesus "to talk about God" and that (2) SS does not say that the Father causes the Son to exist. SS tells us only of the relationship of Father to Son and Son to Father. It tells us only that the Son proceeds from the Father. Natural reason, moreover, forbids us to say that this "proceeding" is just like human generation and an example of Causality. Our "God talk" must correspond to both SS + Reason. Though our only experience is of human causal procession (a father physically generating a son), this is metaphysically impossible in God since the Son (Νοῦς) is God and uncaused. Hence we affirm in our "God talk" that in God there is a non-causal procession of the Son from the Father. We do not know how the divine procession works.

b. Constantinople I (May to July 381): Holy Spirit is $\delta\pi\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ with Father and the Son: defined against Macedonius who believed the Spirit was a creature

- i) This Council represents the final rejection of Arianism in that Arian logical scheme is not accepted in any way as a plausible theory to understand Jesus' revelation of what God is like. This Council concludes the struggle to articulate the Christian belief in the Trinity.
- ii) Religious importance: That God is triune is the basic new position of the New Testament. The implications of this revelation are in fact still being worked out in Christian life.
- iii) Critique: The Christian Church has still to develop the implications of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. This is perhaps the most neglected dogma in Christianity.

c. Ephesus (June 22 - July 17, 431): Mary is Mother of God: defined against Nestorianism

- 1) The shift in theological focus from the 4th to the 5th century is caused by an attempt to understand the Trinity's incarnation in history and human affairs by the Incarnation of the Logos. Two schools of thought or theological method developed in trying to analyze the data of Scripture:

Alexandria (and Rome)

1. $\log\omicron\varsigma \leftrightarrow \sigma\alpha\rho\varsigma$ (word \leftrightarrow flesh)
2. Platonic philosophy
3. allegorical interpretation of SS
4. exponents were: Origen, Athanasius, the Cappadocians (Basil, Gregory, etc.), St. Cyril (insists on one $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$)

Antioch

5. union of divine + human in Christ is a hypostasis, "like fire in a red hot coal"

Antioch

1. $\log\omicron\varsigma \leftrightarrow \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (word-man)
2. Aristotelian philosophy
3. historical, grammatical exegesis
4. exponents were: Lucian of Antioch, Theodore of Tarsus, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius
5. union of divine + human in Christ is a moral union (symploia) only, "the Logos dwells in the man Jesus as in a temple"

IV.

4. c.

ii) Religious importance: The affirmation that Jesus is the Son of God is a strong statement concerning the unity of God and man in Christ; emphasis is once more put on the full humanity of Christ; God's real involvement with the world, entering into human history, is boldly and clearly declared; a foundation is given for Marian devotion.

iii) Critique: Nestorius' emphasis on the full humanity of Christ is the strong point of his position. His weakness is in so constructing his theory the God actually is not incarnate but only the witness, from time to time of what Jesus does and says. Nestorius cannot believe that God can be joined to flesh & blood. His understanding of the Incarnation is too intellectualized. It could be called the "telephone call" theory of the Incarnation. God from time to time informs Jesus of what he should say and do.

d. Chalcedon (Oct. 8 to Nov. 1, 451): In Jesus Christ there are 2 natures (φύσεις) human and divine and one ὑπόστασις = divine "person" of the λόγος. This was defined against Eutyches

i) Eutyches, an elderly and loyal follower of the theology of St. Cyril wanted to keep Cyril's language (one φύσις). Eutyches did not comprehend that the terminology had shifted its meaning in twenty years of theological debate. Eutyches was driven by logic to state that after the union of the divine & human in Christ (from the moment of the Incarnation) one φύσις resulted that was a mixture of the divine & human.

Historical outline. Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, appealed to Pope Leo to answer Eutyches. Leo wrote his famous letter 28 (The Tome of Leo) to settle the question. Eutyches appealed to St. Cyril's nephew, Dioscorus who had succeeded his uncle as Patriarch of Alexandria. Dioscorus persuaded the Roman Emperor Theodosius II to summon a Council at Ephesus in 449 to defend Cyril's teaching and Eutyches. The Council

IV 4. d.

- i) met and Divines provided. The papal delegates were refused their right to provide; Leo's letters were not allowed to be read. Eutyches was excommunicated and Flavian deposed. Pope Leo refused to recognize the Council and furiously denounced it as a Latrocinium: (The Robber Council of Ephesus). With Theodosius' death, Marcian became Emperor and summoned the Council of Chalcedon with Pope Leo's approval.
- ii) religious importance: The Chalcedonian statement of the faith clearly affirms all the elements of the mystery of the Incarnation in a balance between the Alexandrian & the Antiochene schools of theology. It is the classic & fundamental response of the Christian Church to the question: what think ye of Christ?
- iii) Critique: Eutyches' solution to the problem of the divine & human in Christ would have made Christ neither God or man but a third thing, which would be neither consubstantial with God or us. Eutyches is the classic example of a conservative who in an attempt to maintain verbal orthodoxy (keeping terms whose meaning has changed) falls into serious error. It may be asked whether popular piety concerning Jesus is in fact monophysite? (Eutyches' third thing!! as a picture of Jesus of Nazareth).

H. J. Ryan, S. J.

V. The Emergence of the Primacy of the Roman See:

A. The Meaning of the Terms:

1. Roman: the local church community at Rome which was the capital city of the Roman Empire. This community of Christians by the early 70's of the first century had gained great prominence in the Church. Paul had written to this community, Peter and Paul had exercised their ministry there and were martyred there. This community had suffered persecution under Nero and by the end of the first century was the largest, richest and most generous of the Christian communities. The head of the Roman college of presbyters, Clement, had successfully exercised a supervisory role over the Christian community of Corinth. By 250 A.D., Rome, as the center of theology, had solved the Trinitarian and Christological controversies even before they surfaced to trouble the Eastern half of the Empire in the next two centuries. The solution of these controversies at Nicaea, Constantinople I, Ephesus and Chalcedon were solutions offered by or consistent with the regula fidei (rule of faith) of the Roman Church. No other Christian community possessed the prestige of Rome. The Jerusalem church had been dispersed in the rebellion of 65-70 A.D. Antioch, tainted by the heresy of Paul of Samosata, had been conquered by the Persians in the mid-third century and was on the outskirts of the Empire. Nestorius, condemned at Ephesus, was removed as Patriarch of Constantinople and Dioscorus, condemned at Chalcedon, was removed as Patriarch of Alexandria. Both condemnations cost these churches greatly in prestige. By the middle of the 5th century Rome was the Center of the Christian Church.

V. The Emergence of the Primacy of the Roman See:

A. The Meaning of the Terms:

2. See: from the Latin word sedes = seat, chair, throne, bench. Sedes is a symbol of judicial authority. Court is in session (from the same Latin root: sedeo, sedere, sedi, sessus). The central idea is that the See performs some normative, judgmental function to settle disputes or controversies. Even from the time of Clement (94-96 A.D.) the Roman See was exercising this judgmental function. Throughout the Trinitarian and Christological controversies the Roman See used her regula fidei to propose the solution to the problems vexing the Eastern churches. This judgmental function was formally approved by the Symbol of Sardica at the height of the Arian controversy and extended even to the regula vitae (rule of life) or discipline of the Church. The Roman See was accepted as "the court of appeals." The Roman See was the center of the communio = κοινωνία community of all the local churches. (Cf. Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiae (separate sheet)).

3. Primacy: the condition or state of "being first." At the present time California has a primacy among the United States; yet California cannot set-up norms for the other states or determine the conditions for them to fulfill in order to enter into (federal) union with her. The Roman primacy is the primacy of a See. It is a judgmental and normative primacy. The Roman primacy involves setting up norms (regula fidei and regula vitae) which must be fulfilled by the other local churches as conditions before the Roman See judges them to be in the union of the other local churches, i.e., the communio or κοινωνία.

V. The Emergence of the Primacy of the Roman See:

B. The Present Situation:

1. The Roman Catholic Church understands the Primacy of the Roman See in terms defined at Vatican Council I in 1870. She believes the Roman See and its bishop possess a primacy of jurisdiction jure divino (by Jesus' explicit desire). The separated Eastern (Orthodox) Churches, (Greek, Russian etc.) admit only a primacy of honor (suggestive, not normative judgment). Most separated Western Christian Churches totally reject the idea of any sort of primacy of the Roman See in the Christian Church.

2. Problems:

- a) The heart of the problem of the division of the Christian churches and the most difficult question in the ecumenical movement (Christian movement to foster the unity of the Christian Church) is the position of the Roman See in the Christian community.
- b) The Roman Catholic Church's understanding of the primacy in terms of the primacy of jurisdiction rests upon the unique experience of the early middle ages (650-1050) when civil government collapsed and civil as well as ecclesiastical cases were not only "appealed" to Rome but where Rome acted as "a court of first instance." With the recovery of civil order, the secular authority moved to recover a judicial function for itself and the controversy over the relation of "Church and State" began. To define that relation the Roman Church evolved in Latin canonical legal terms the primacy of jurisdiction in Church affairs. This experience was not shared by the Christian East. In the 16th century the "reformers" rejected the status quo of Church-State relations and consequently denied the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman See.

V. The Emergence of the Primacy of the Roman See:

C. The Evidence:

1. Cautions:

In examining the data on the Primacy of the Roman See two dangers must be cautioned against:

- a) To assume that the patristic evidence will clearly show the experience of the primacy of jurisdiction as it emerged in Latin canonical and theological reflection in the "Church-State" controversies in the Latin West after 1050 A.D.
- b) To assume that the patristic period justified the Roman primacy before it actually began to operate by appealing to Mt. 16, 19 et seq. as a reason to use the Roman See as a "court of appeals."

If one were to conduct research based upon one or both of these assumptions, the research would prove a fruitless effort as so much polemical apologetics will attest.

2. The Patristic Evidence:

cf. Bettenson, pp. 79-83 and later developments Ibid. pp. 89-136.

All the revelant texts with a fine commentary may be found in

E. Giles, Documents Illustrating Papal Authority 96-454. S.P.C.K., London, 1952, XXI-344.

3. The Matthean text (Matthew 16, 16 et seq.)

ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Μακάριος εἶ Σίμων βαριωνά, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψεν σοὶ ἀλλ' ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· καὶ γὰρ σὺ λέγεις ἐπὶ σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὴν πύλαν ᾗ οὐ κατασχύσουσιν αὐτῇς. [καὶ] δώσω σοὶ τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὅ,τι ἐὰν δέσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται

δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δ' ἐὰν λύσῃς
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. ...

Simon Peter answered and said you are the Christ, the son of the living God. Jesus replied by saying to him: Blessed are you Simon, Son of Jonah, because flesh and blood have not made it clear to you but the Father, mine, in heaven. And let me say this to you that you are Peter and upon this rock (ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ) I shall build my church and the jaws of Hades will not overcome it. (And) I give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven. . . .

How did the Fathers of the Church exegete (explain from SS) the rock?

The rock is Peter: Tertullian, De Praescriptione; Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiae, Epistolae 66, 70, 71, 73; Firmilian in the Letter to Cyprian in Cyprian's Epistolae, 75; Ambrose, Expositio in Lucam Bk. 10; Augustine, Retractationes Bk. I, chapter 21. Philip, Roman legate at Ephesus in Acts of the Council of Ephesus 3rd Session, July 11, 431, Cf. Schwartz, ACO I, I, 3, 59; Leo, Sermo V; Paschasius at Council of Chalcedon, 3rd Session, Oct. 13, 451, Cf. Schwartz, ACO II, I, 273.

faith confessed by Peter: Hilary, De Trinitate, Bk. VIII; Chrysostom, On Penitence, Homily V; Cyril, On the Holy Trinity, Dialogue IV; Leo, Sermo IV.

the saints or the bishops: Origen, Commentary on Matthew, Bk. XII; Cyprian, Epistola 35.

Christ: Jerome, Adversus Jovinianum, Bk. 2; Augustine, Sermo CCXCV, In Johannis Evangelium, 123.

See of Peter (chair of Peter): Jerome, Epistola 15 ad Damasum Papam.

Peter's Successors: Augustine, Psalmus contra Partem Donati.

V.

D. Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiae (PL 4, 498; ANCL 8, 380)

. . . The Lord says to Peter, "I say unto thee," says he, "that thou art Peter. . . shall be loosed also in heaven." AND AGAIN TO THE SAME AFTER HIS RESURRECTION HE SAYS "FEED MY SHEEP." Upon THAT one he builds his Church, AND HE COMMITS TO HIM HIS SHEEP TO FEED. And though to all the apostles after his resurrection he gives an equal power and says, "As the Father sent me, even so send I you; receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them: whose ye retain, shall be retained," yet in order that he might make clear the unity, HE FOUNDED ONE CHAIR; by his authority he has placed the source of the same unity as beginning from one. Certainly the other apostles were what Peter was, endowed with equal fellowship both of honour and of power, but a beginning is made from unity, AND PRIMACY IS GIVEN TO PETER, that one Church of Christ AND ONE CHAIR may be shown: AND THEY ARE ALL SHEPHERDS AND ONE FLOCK IS EXHIBITED, WHICH IS FED BY ALL THE APOSTLES WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT, that one Church of Christ may be shown. This one Church, also, the Holy Ghost in the person of the Lord describes in the Song of Songs and says: "My dove, my spotless one, is but one; she is the only one of her mother, elect of her that bare her." He who does not hold this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He who opposes and resists the Church, HE WHO DESERTS THE CHAIR OF PETER ON WHOM THE CHURCH IS FOUNDED, does he trust himself to be in the Church? For the blessed apostle Paul teaches this same thing, and expounds the sacrament of unity saying, "One body and one spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God."

We ought firmly to hold and assert this unity, especially we bishops. . .

12-1-73
21.320

AIDS FOR A CRITICAL APPRAISAL
OF
J. C. GAGER, KINGDOM AND COMMUNITY

- 1. What is the purpose of Gager's book? Cf. 12, 2nd paragraph.
2. What are his presuppositions? Cf. 6, 1st paragraph; 7, first 2 sentences. 28, end of 2nd paragraph; 29, 2nd sentence of 1st paragraph; 33, 4th paragraph 4th sentence; 70, end of 2nd paragraph; 71-72, first sentences of this paragraph; 73, next to the last sentence before the quote; 79, sentence ending with footnote 55; 107, first sentence of the third paragraph; 118, first sentence of the third paragraph.
3. Does Gager make conclusions more apodictically than his hypothetical method would allow? Cf. 21, 2nd paragraph first 3 sentences and compare this with 33, 3rd paragraph after the quote ending in footnote 55.
4. Are there ~~examples~~ examples of incorrect marshalling of evidence for a development that in fact did not take place as Gager would have it? Cf. 45. Is there a well known Christian prayer, quoted from Matthew and Luke that would cause destruction of Gager's argument on this point?
5. Is Gager guilty of committing really serious misrepresentations of the data in order to conform the data to a general model? Cf. 115-142.
6. What are the good points of Gager's book? Cf. 115-142.
7. What is your general judgment of Gager's book?
8. What have you learned from reading and analysing Gager?

H. J. Ryan, Jr.